The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.29

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1890.

VOL. XXIX.

LONDON:
"CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160 FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXIX.

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Social Perils—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D. ... 1
The Principles of the Church of England—By Ven. W. H. Taylor, D.D. 5
Socialism in the Light of Holy Scripture—By Rev. John Shephard, M.A. 6
Worshipping the Risen Lord—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 13
Innocency—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D. ... 25
A Great Scholar and Model Bishop—By Rev. Canon Westcott, D.D. 37
The Peace of God—By Rev. Canon Duckworth, D.D. 40
The Divine Saviour—By Bishop of Rochester ... 49
Tophet and its Antitype—By Rev. William Pope, M.A. 52
The Circumcision of Christ and New Year's Day—By Rev. J. A. Carr, LL.D. 55
Christ's Last Charge—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 61
Christ's Education—By Bishop of Meath 73
Neutrality—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D. ... 76
Funeral Sermon on Richard Somers, Esq.—By Rev. James Hamilton, B.A. 85
The Nobility of Man—I.—By Rev. T. Selby Henrey 87
The Temptation of Christ.—I.—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 97
The Nobility of Man.—II.—By Rev. T. Selby Henrey 99
The Temptation of Christ.—II.—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 109
The Nobility of Man.—III.—By Rev. T. Selby Henrey 111
The Temptation of Christ.—III.—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 121
The Nobility of Man.—IV.—By Rev. T. Selby Henrey 124
Repentance, Confession, Absolution—By Rev. Canon Rawstorne, M.A.... 133
The Temptation of Christ.—IV.—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 136
The Temptation of Christ.—V.—By Rev. B. Maturin, M.A. 145
The Place of Faith in the Christian System—By Rev. J. L. Roberts, M.A. 148
Forgeries—By Rev. R. R. Kane, LL.D. 157
The Spirit of Doubt—By Rev. W. A. Cutting, M.A. 160
The Resurrection as a Watchword—By Rev. Francis Paget, D.D. 169
Christ Greater than Solomon—By Rev. G. Jannings, M.A. 171
The Ten Virgins: The Last Days of the Church on Earth—By Bishop of Meath 181

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

The Conditions of Christian Discipleship—By Rev. J. P. Sandlands, M.A. 185
The Ground of our Faith—By Rev. John Napleton 193
As Little Children—By Rev. Harry Jones, M.A. ... 195
Liberty of the Christian Life—By Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D. 205
Children of the Free Woman—By Rev. E. Herbert Jones 209
Resurrection the Proof of Divinity—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 217
Building—Ancient and Modern—By the Archbishop of Canterbury 229
The Supreme Model—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 241
The Gifts of the Ascended Christ—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett, M.A. 253
The Betterment of Character—By Rev. Edgar C. S. Gibson, M.A. 256
The Inspiration of Selection—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D.... 265
Life in Nature and in Christ—By Rev. W. Done Bushell, M.A. 277
Ventures for God—By Rev. J. A. Carr, LL.D. ... 279
The Victory of Faith—By Rev. Canon Liddon, D.D. 289
Incentives to Christian Love—By Rev. J. W. Kaye 294
The Earliest Missionary Organisation of the Christian Church—By Bishop of Meath 301

SERMONS BY :—

Archbishop of Canterbury—Building—Ancient and Modern 229
Bishop of Rochester—The Divine Saviour 49
Bishop of Meath—Christ's Education 73
Bishop of Meath—The Ten Virgins: The Last Days of the Church on Earth 181
Bishop of Meath—The Earliest Missionary Organisation of the Christian Church 301
Bassett, Rev. Prebendary, M.A.—The Gifts of the Ascended Christ 253
Brooks, Rev. Phillips, D.D.—Liberty of the Christian Life 205
Bushell, Rev. W. Done, M.A.—Life in Nature and in Christ 277
Carr, Rev. J. A., LL.D.—The Circumcision of Christ and New Year's Day 55
Carr, Rev. J. A., LL.D.—Ventures for God ... 279
Cutting, Rev. W. A., M.A.—The Spirit of Doubt... 160
Duckworth, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Peace of God 40
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D.—Social Perils ... 1
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D.—Innocency ... 25
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D.—Neutrality ... 76

28.05
G42.0
1.35

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Gibson, Rev. Edgar C. S., M.A.—The Betterment of Character 256
Hamilton, Rev. James, B.A.—Funeral Sermon on Richard Somers, Esq. 85
Henrey, Rev. T. Selby—The Nobility of Man.—I.. 87
Henrey, Rev. T. Selby—The Nobility of Man.—II. 99
Henrey, Rev. T. Selby—The Nobility of Man.—III. 111
Henrey, Rev. T. Selby—The Nobility of Man.—IV. 124
Jannings, Rev. G., M.A.—Christ Greater than Solomon 171
Jones, Rev. E. Herbert—Children of the Free Woman 209
Jones, Rev. Harry, M.A.—As Little Children ... 195
Kane, Rev. R. R., LL.D.—Forgeries 157
Kaye, Rev. J. W.—Incentives to Christian Love ... 294
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D. — Worshipping the Risen Lord... 13
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—Christ's Last Charge... 61
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—Resurrection the Proof of Divinity... 217
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Supreme Model... 241
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Inspiration of Selection 265
Liddon, Rev. Canon, D.D. - The Victory of Faith... 289
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—The Temptation of Christ. —I.... 97
Maturin Rev. B., M.A.—The Temptation of Christ. —II. 109
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—The Temptation of Christ. —III. 121
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—The Temptation of Christ. —IV. 136
Maturin, Rev. B., M.A.—The Temptation of Christ. —V. 145
Napleton, Rev. John—The Ground of our Faith ... 193
Paget, Rev. Francis, D.D.—The Resurrection as a Watchword 169
Pope, Rev. William, M.A.—Tophet and its Antitype 52
Rawstorne, Rev. Canon, M.A.—Repentance, Confession, Absolution 133
Roberts, Rev. J. L., M.A.—The Place of Faith in the Christian System 148
Sandlands, Rev. J. P., M.A.—The Conditions of Christian Discipleship 185
Shephard, Rev. John, M.A.—Socialism in the Light of Holy Scripture... 6
Taylor, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D. - The Principles of the Church of England 5
Westcott, Rev. Canon, D.D.—A Great Scholar and Model Bishop 37

LEADING ARTICLES :—

Cleanliness.—II. 8
The Political Situation 18
Rural Deans 29
The Work of God and Man in the Christian Character 44
Difficult Parishes 57
Colonization of Palestine 66
Anglo-Israelism 79 151
Continental Restrictions on Peace Propagandism ... 90
Non-Military Histories... 104
Churchmen in Council... 115
Popular Control 128
The Prudential Assurance Company... 139
Brotherhoods 162
Bismarck's Resignation 174
The Clergy and the Play 188
The Irish Land Purchase Bill... 198
"Truth" or Falsehood 212
Missionaries and Statesmen 222
Ritualism in the Church of Ireland 222
Technical Education 235

LEADING ARTICLES :— PAGE

Gladstone and Disestablishment 246
German Military Despotism 260
Temperance Fanaticism 272
Intemperate Temperance 281
Incumbent and Curate... 296
The Parliamentary Session 307

PAPERS :—

Bishop Lightfoot 9
The Origin and History of the Diaconate—By Rev. John J. Coleman, M.A. 20, 30
The Late Rev. Aubrey L. Moore 44
Frederick William Robertson—By Rev. Thomas B. Naylor, B.D. 151
Rev. Canon Benham on Peace Efforts 179
Paulinus of Nola.—A Study of the Fourth Century —By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 189, 198, 223, 236, 247
St. Michael's, Coventry: Past, Present, and Future —By Rev. John Napleton 213
Ritualism in the Church of Ireland 222
The Time of Jacob's Trouble—By Rev. Ralph W. Harden 232, 260, 273, 283
Lux Mundi—By Rev. Prebendary Bassett, M.A. 296, 308

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"*The Expositor*" ... 33, 80, 153, 174, 237, 275
"Christ and His Surroundings"—By James Moorhouse, Bishop of Manchester 67
"Sermons on the Prophets of the Old Testament" —By Rev. Julius Lloyd, Hon. Canon of Manchester 105
"High Days of the Christian Church," &c.—By the Very Rev. Andrew Tait, D.D., &c., Provost of Tuam 141
"The Lord's Supper" 163
"Words for Peace: A Pastoral, etc."—By the Most Rev. Lord Plunket, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin 175
"Jehovah-Jesus: The Divine Appearances"—By G. F. Townsend, D.C L. 190
"A Memory of Edward Thring"—By John Huntley Skrine, Warden of Glenalmond ... 201
"Ex Opere Operato," etc.—By Right Hon. R. T. Warren, LL.D., Chancellor of Cashel, etc. ... 201
"*The Treasury*" 215
"The Old Documents and the New Bible"—By Rev. J. Paterson Forsyth, etc. 224
"Church or Chapel," an Eirenicon—By Rev. Joseph Hammond, LL.B., B.A.... 224
"An Analysis of the Fifth Book of Hooker, etc., in the form of Question and Answer—By Rev. George Nelson, LL.D., etc., etc. 237
"The Sermon Bible"... 275

CORRESPONDENCE :—

"Perfectly Absurd" 11, 23, 35, 46, 59, 70
St. John vi. 11, 23, 47, 82
The Ornaments Rubric 23, 83
The Fatherhood of God 33, 45, 47, 57, 68, 80, 91, 107
Critique on a Sentence in a Valuable Sermon ... 35
Inaccurate Language 47
The Late Dr. Littledale 69, 82, 118, 142, 155, 166, 177, 190, 227
The So-Called Medical Language in the Third Gospel 71, 82, 94, 108, 116, 129, 163, 175, 203, 227, 251, 310
St. Chrysostom and the Bishop of Argyle 81
Eternal Punishment 92, 106, 119
The New Spanish Prayer-Book 93
The Universalist's View of the Atonement 93
St. Thomas's Appeal to a Higher Court 94
Should Rebels be in the Fort or out of it" 94

988263

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

Is our Lord a Judge or Merely an Advocate ... 107
Paul or John 117, 131, 155
What is really Legal and what Allowed by Use ... 119
Christ's Education 130
A Few Questions on the Sacraments as Taught in the Church Catechism 131
The Atonement... ... ... 132, 141
The Pulpit Commentary on Revelation 142
Free Education... 143
The Human Knowledge of Christ 154, 165
Misconceptions 155, 167
Churchmen in Council... 166
An Argument for the Doctrine of the Real Presence 167
Repentance, Confession, Absolution... ... 175, 191
Christ and the Old Testament 176, 203, 215, 239, 250, 288, 299
Do We and Rome Agree as to Corporal Presence and Adoration thereof? 178
The Fulness of Time 215
Judge Warren's Pamphlet ...225, 239, 250, 287, 300
Evolution 226, 276, 286, 299
Religion 227
Mr. Gladstone as Lector 227
Evolution and Darwinism 238, 261
Corrections 239
The Bennett Judgment Misunderstood or Misrepresented 263
Sisterhoods in Ireland.—An Appeal to England ... 275

POETRY :—

In Perils of Waters (J. N.) 240

MISCELLANEOUS :—

Free Marriages 8
Dr. Parry's Resignation 8
The John Lister Knight's Fund 10
Little Comberton Church 10
The Late Bishop of Durham.—Special Service at Trinity College Chapel, Cambridge 12
Mission Work of Merchant Taylors' School... ... 12
Archdeacon Blakeney, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty 12
Dr. M. J. Monk Appointed Organist to Truro Cathedral 12
The House of Laymen... 18
The Office and Title of Lector 18
The Bishop of Manchester and "Literates" ... 24

MISCELLANEOUS :— PAGE

Election of Canon Fielden as Proctor in the Convocation of York 29
The Rev. J. H. Keen and the Church Missionary Society 30
Sudden Death of the Rev. George Stopford Ram ... 30
Departure of the Bishop of Melanesia 36
Complications in the Diocese of St. Asaph 36
York Diocesan Conference 36
The Health of the Bishop of St. Albans 45
Funeral Reform 48, 199
The Stanley Show of Cycles 48
Indisposition of Canon Hoste... 60
Plans of the Church House 66
Dissenting Ministers Admitted to Holy Orders 60, 95, 120
Inauguration of a Cambridge House in the East End 95
Professor Margoliouth on Ecclesiasticus 95
Bishop of London's Fund 95
Archdeacon Boyd's Resignation 96
Rev. A. J. Carlyle, Secretary to the S.P.C.K. ... 108
Informal Election of Hulsean Lecturer 120
Bampton Lectures 128
Retirement of the Bishop of Bangor 128
Rev. A. R. Tucker, Bishop of East Equatorial Africa 144
Pembroke College, Cambridge, Mission in Walworth 162
Consecration of Dr. Westcott... 162
East London Church Council on Dwellings... ... 179
American Bishops' Gift to Lambeth Palace... ... 179
The Formal Election of the Bishop of Durham ... 192
Letter from the Bishop of Truro 192
Overcrowded Cemeteries 199
The Rev. Dr. T. G. Bonney Appointed Boyle Lecturer 237
The New Principal of Trinity College, Kandy ... 245
The Re-opening of St. John's, Clerkenwell... ... 281
The Divinity Professorship at Cambridge 288
Election of Mr. Slater as Proctor in Convocation ... 300

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, 276, 288, 300, 312

The Church of England Pulpit

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXXIX.—No. 732. SATURDAY, JANUARY 4, 1890. PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SOCIAL PERILS.

BY REV. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

"Jesus saith unto them, I have compassion on the multitude."—MARK viii. 2.

NO man who has in him the least element of seriousness can fail to observe that though every age and nation has to face its own grave problems, no problems were ever graver than those which are now beginning to press upon this nation and this age. I will not dwell upon them at length, because at Westminster Abbey it has recently been my duty to do so; but I will ask you to observe generally the following facts, and to endeavour, as I mention them, to grasp their full significance. First, by a slow and hardly-noticed social revolution, the old, sweet country life of England is being merged into the fevering and struggling life of cities—a life which, in the the long run, deeply injures alike the physical stamina and the moral character of their inhabitants. Secondly, the population is increasing with such fermenting and irrepressible rapidity that within part of a century alone it has multiplied more than in six entire centuries after the Conquest. Thirdly, this increase is, in a great measure, the increase of the unfit, so that the births in the slums, in the backways and streets of the city are ten times more rapid than the births in the squares and in its prosperous portions, which means that the labour market is in danger of being swamped by a stunted and decrepit swarm of men and women, who can bring little to the work of life but appetites and unskilled labour, nothing but the crudest forms of seething vitality and superfluous toil. Fourthly, this increase of the most unfit is largely due to the curse of immature and disgracefully early marriages, which abound most just where they are least justifiable, and in which the half-starved offspring grow up too often in an atmosphere of drink and blasphemy and dirt. Fifthly, the conditions of labour and healthy life are still further complicated by the large and steady increase into London especially of indigent Irish, indigent Jews, indigent Germans, indigent foreigners of all nations, who tend more and more to crowd out our own population into conditions of hopeless struggle. Sixthly, the demon sway of intemperance is still unbroken, and the crime and misery of many of the worst districts are indescribably shocking, mainly because we deliberately confront the minimum of moral strength with the maximum of terrible temptation. Seventhly, the wealth of England is, for the most part, congested in comparatively few hands, so that the enormous increase of wealth—greater, as Mr. Gladstone has said, from 1800 to 1850 than from the days of Julius Cæsar to 1800, and greater from 1850 to 1870 than from 1800 to 1850—has yet not meant an increase of the general prosperity; for in spite of a national income which is reckoned at a thousand million pounds a year, and a national investment which is reckoned at one hundred and thirty million pounds a year, the vast majority of the people are still in a condition of poverty or of struggle. Eighthly, our whole industrial system seems likely to be endangered at no very recent date by terrible cyclones of disturbance; and when the diminished profits of the capitalist, due to reckless competition and overproduction, both domestic and international, have ended, as they must end, in glutted markets and commercial stagnation, the consequences can hardly fail to be trying and terrible. In a certain number of years it seems likely that we may have hundreds of thousands instead of, as we now have, tens of thousands of the unemployed. Ninthly, commercial and agricultural distress have already affected the interest of at least five very large classes of Englishmen—the tenant farmers, of whom many are on the verge of bankruptcy; the small shopkeepers, who suffer from the inevitably changing conditions of retail trade; the clergy, of whom multitudes have been reduced to painful conditions; the clerks, whose little-skilled employ-

ment is rendered less valuable by boundless competition and by the superior attainments of Germans; the working classes, many of whom are being dispossessed by foreigners more diligent and more sober, and who, even when they do not suffer from diminished wages, do suffer from more uncertain and more irregular employment. Tenthly and lastly of these considerations—which if you will, indeed, grasp them, you will see to be most grave—as these conditions at the present moment seem all to be on the increase, it looks but too probable that days are at hand for this nation which, apart from unseen interventions of God's providence, and without our most heroic and most self-denying exertions, may be but the first drops of a thunder shower, and may bring upon us an age more full of calamity than England has ever yet seen, at any rate, since the Middle Ages—the middle of the fourteenth century—when the Black Death devastated our land and halved our population. Surely, therefore, these signs of the times, which no optimism can disguise and no apathy can ignore, are so many warnings to every one of us to be up and doing. They need all our nerve and all our resolution, all the Christian effort which the brain of the ablest can sustain, all the devoted self-denial which the strongest and wisest can bring to bear upon our national and individual amelioration. Patriotism and philanthropy add their appealing voices to the eternal call of Christianity, and bid every man who is in earnest to live, not for himself only, but for the blessing and amelioration of his brethren who are in the world.

This evening we will confine our thoughts to London, and in London these problems face us in their worst virulence. Already the hugest city by far that the world has ever seen, so that its daily supply of provisions is itself like a standing miracle, it is becoming more and more unwieldy by the yearly addition of at least seventy thousand to its population. In its area, now only swept by a radius of fifteen miles, it congregates nearly as many inhabitants as the whole of Ireland; it has in it more Jews than Palestine, more Roman Catholics than Rome, more Irishmen than Belfast, more Scotchmen than Aberdeen, more Welshmen than Cardiff. It has seven thousand miles of streets, and adds yearly to its vast extent many miles of new streets. Every day some two hundred and forty souls are added to its population; every few minutes a human being is born into the world in this city; every six minutes a human being dies in this city. Since we met in this Cathedral, at least ten immortal souls in this city have sighed their last sigh on earth, and have flickered for ever from this region of shadows and illusions to yonder world where all is judged of truly.

And London, being such as it is, presents two further aggravations of the problems of great cities—one general and one special. The general aggravation is that, to an extent never surpassed, the most colossal wealth is to be seen side by side with the most abject poverty. There have been great cities in which there has been no such glaring contrast; but the cities in which that contrast has been most observable have been those which, like Babylon, and Tyre, and Rome, and Ephesus, were doomed to destruction by the awful burdens of prophecy. London has two aspects, with both of which we are very familiar: one of pleasure, splendour, luxury; the other of dulness, squalor, and misery. Walk in the parks or the wealthy streets of London, and you will observe with delight hundreds of superb equipages, with their liveried servants, the rich dresses and aristocratic beauty of their occupants, the loveliness of the children set forth in the loveliness of their apparel; you will see in the shops treasures from every mart, from Samarkand to the cedars of Lebanon, jewels of priceless value, fabrics of exquisite texture, the richest fruits, the most gorgeous flowers—all that Nature, all that art, all that science can minister to the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, to an extent to which even Tyre and Babylon and Rome had hardly dreamed. And those rich people come to it, for the most part, for a season, only from castles by the sea, or from the moors and mountains of the North, and from lovely pleasaunces, where the terrible shadows of the cypress fall on the smooth turf, and the "swans float double in the shining meers." But hard by are the shadows always flung on a brilliant civilisation. In ancient cities there were the gladiators and the slaves; but in modern cities, too, there is a certain mass of crushed or unreclaimed humanity, the canker that feeds on the exuberance of luxury and perforates it with misery and decay. Here and there you will see the prison, the penitentiary, the workhouse, the asylum, the gin-shop, the thieves' lodging, the drunkards' cell, the penny gaff, the police-courts, the youth-corrupting music-halls, besides the palaces and temples; behind them lurk haunts of festering evils. The common lodging-houses have 27,000 inhabitants, and into them drifts the miserable social wreckage of all classes alike. There are 800,000 paupers, and half-a-million supported more or less by charity. There are hundreds, even thousands, of neglected children who live by prowling in the markets, and the gutters, and the railway arches. In London alone, most wretched of all the wretched, there are as many fallen women as all the inhabitants of Norwich; as many known criminals as all the inhabitants of Huntingdon; as many on the verge of destitution as twice over all the inhabitants of Nottingham; and the whole population, on any given Sunday, it seems probable, only furnishes one out of four who enter any place of worship. And the special aggravation of London is that the poor are not evenly distributed through-

out the whole vast area, but are crowded in disproportionate numbers in the East-end parishes, some of which, with their great masses, after all the heroic efforts of the last few years especially, are all but untouched by any religious influence whatever, and which present the frightful spectacle of a large pauper class living on alms and rates and odd jobs in the misery of a chronic indigence and in the sensuality of a godless despair. Let the testimony of one of the most able and perfectly impartial witnesses suffice to remind you of the state of things. "After living for some years in such a portion of the East-end," says Professor Huxley, "over and above the physical misery, the impression has never died out of my mind of the supernatural and perfectly astonishing dulness and deadness of the existence of these poor people. Over that parish Dante's inscription might have been written

All hope abandon ye that enter here.

There was no amusement to diversify the dull round of life except the public-house; there was nothing to remind the people of anything in the whole universe beyond their miserable toil, rewarded by slow starvation. I left that scene, to my great satisfaction, and some time after I embarked on a voyage round the world, where I had an opportunity of seeing savage life in all conceivable conditions of savage description; and I can assure you that in this experience of mine I found nothing worse, nothing more degrading, nothing nearly so dull and intolerably miserable as the life I had left behind me in the East-end of London. For although the savage may perish of hunger or of violence, and never knows whether his life may be his own for twenty-four hours, yet there is life in him. The savage is a man; he is not a mere machine, with so much mechanical energy at the expense of so much food. I say, if the alternative were presented to me to choose the life of one of these people in the East-end or that of a savage, I would distinctly choose the latter. Nothing could please me better," he adds, "not even the discovery of a new truth, than to contribute towards the bettering of that state of things, which unless wise and benevolent men take it in hand, will tend to become worse, or create something worse than savagery, a great Serbonian Bog which, in the long run, will swallow up the surface-crust of our civilisation."

Now, this being the condition of multitudes and multitudes of human beings at the East-end of London, I lay down two axioms. One is, that if this state of things be selfishly neglected or apathetically ignored, it can only end in social revolution or in some great similar catastrophe. The other is, that assuredly no miracle will be wrought to make us happy in spite of our endeavours, and that, as in all that concerns man, amelioration can only be the outcome of determined and continuous effort. The fingers of a man's hand have gone forth to write a warning, as it seems to me, upon the palace walls of our national prosperity; when we take heed, then perhaps those fingers may be removed; but unless we take heed the letters of warning will glare and redden into messages of doom. It is the law of God's economy, shown in all His government, that He never does for man miraculously that which it is man's duty and in man's power to achieve naturally for himself. National neglect, when it has conceived, brings forth national degeneracy, and national degeneracy, when it is finished, means nothing less than national destruction.

But there is one power, and one alone, which can adequately grapple with these colossal problems; it is the power of the Church of Christ. In the parochial system of the Church of England we have a priceless agency, and one which in hundreds of city parishes is grasping almost single-handed with over-population, and godlessness, and misery, and crime. Under immense discouragements, amid lives heroically upborne by faith and hope, passing as they are under skies of leaden gloom, hundreds of devoted clergymen are hurling the whole force of their spiritual energy against vast accumulations of misery and vice in this long-neglected and rapidly-multiplying population, and by the enthusiasm which they evoke in all pure and noble souls they are sending forth hundreds of white-winged messengers of mercy and ministrations to upraise and to console. If their hands are not strengthened by the work and by the gifts of the people of England, it will be as when a standard-bearer falleth. Much is being done—much, above all, has been done—within the last ten years; but unless far more still be done, the tide of battle against the forces of evil which are so strong in the curses of drink and degradation, so far from advancing to victory, will be rolled back, first into faint resistance, and then into final rout. If, on the other hand, we, as Christian people, awake, though late, but to a full sense of the tremendous seriousness of the task which lies before us, if we shake off for ever that eighteenth-century torpor which lost to the Church of England the allegiance of the masses of her working population; if we once for all drive home into the minds of the nominal Christian millions that they and not the clergy only, are the Church of God; if we make all Christian men and women realise to the full their individual share in the general responsibility which God has given them, and of which they are the appointed stewards and not the owners, then, indeed, in this million-fold multiplication of individual energy there is a brighter hope that the future may not be wholly overwhelmed by the over-swelling billows of this tide of advancing peril. In the Middle Ages, Europe swept away by the blind enthusiasm of the crusading spirit, seemed, if I may quote the powerful phrase of the princess historian, to tear itself up by the roots and fling itself

upon the world. Is the arm of God shortened? Is the Spirit of God quenched? Is there no enthusiasm now? Are there no means of kindling that better and wiser enthusiasm which is not to win back one dead sepulchre of Christ, but to win back hundreds and thousands of Christ's living temples, which would make each man and each woman feel their full share in the common duty of all, and compel them to the Divine and never-ending crusade, to plunge personally, in whatever form God demands them, in this Armageddon of battle against the forces of vice and crime, so as to hasten that day when the kingdoms of this world shall become at last the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ?

For, indeed, there is one gospel to the poor, and that is the Gospel of Christ. Political economy has no gospel for them, but only bitter lessons about the blind forces of supply and demand; Socialism has no gospel for them, but only the desperate lessons of confiscation; science has no gospel for them, but only the pitiless assurance that the weakest must go to the wall, and that those who drop from feebleness in the desperate race of life, will be trodden under foot by the myriad fleeting feet of advancing generations; Nature has no gospel for them but the revelation of passionless forces which have been described as blind as fate, merciless as tyranny, merciless as death; which have no ear to hear, no heart to pity, and no arm to save. Even duty has no gospel for them, but only holds up before men's consciences a naked law, which always, indeed, has an inherent majesty to inspire respect, but which has no spell to secure obedience, and has only an exceptionless menace of death against all transgressions. The Lord Jesus Christ alone has a gospel for the many, and a gospel for the poor, and for the oppressed—a gospel of peace, and hope, and freedom, and illimitable promise. He alone, who on earth lived as a poor man, and loved the poor, and lived among the poor, uplifts to them in patient appeal the bleeding hand which was nailed to the cross, not in wrath, not in menace, not as in the awful picture of the last judgment by Michael Angelo, to drive them in lost multitudes into the abyss of the flame, but the bleeding hand which He uplifts to them in the gentlest of all appeals to save and heal and bless.

And, lastly, let this very Cathedral in which we are assembled teach us a lesson and inspire us with the hope that faithful service to Christ, perform it whosoever will, never shall and never can be in vain. A great writer, not long taken from us, who spent almost the whole of his life in London, has told us how London seemed to him a wild, wondrous chaotic den of discord. "I have often been awe-struck to wander along its crowded streets, and to hear the roaring torrent of men and animals and carriages and waggons, all rushing, they know not whence, they know not whither. Nevertheless," he says, "there is a deep, Divine meaning in it, and God is in the midst of it, had we but eyes to see." But elsewhere he tells us how, when he first walked along Cheapside, he was taken aback by the first sight of St. Paul's Cathedral, as it broke upon him towering above the bustling pigmies and the innumerable jinglings and rollings and crashings of many-coloured labour. It was silent as Tadmor in the wilderness — gigantic, beautiful, enduring; it seemed to frown down with rebuking pity on the vain scramble which it overlooked. At its feet were tombstones; above it was the everlasting sky; within priests, perhaps, were chanting Psalms; it seemed to transmit with a stern voice the sounds of death, judgment, and eternity through all the frivolous and fluctuating city. Yes, may we not add that the golden cross is above it? High above the turmoil of men, high above the fogs and mists of the river gleams in the sunlight that golden cross. It is the symbol of victorious agony, of transmuted sorrow, of defeated sin; it is the symbol of God's infinite mercy and of man's perfect redemption. On the grand Cathedral of Paris is a ghastly figure, a sort of demon symbol of the cruel vice and maddening misery of city corruption. In very truth, the cruel vice and maddening misery are there and here also; but we will make the cross, and not the demon, our emblem of city life. It is true, as the voice of one of our greatest statesmen has warned us, that it is against the ordinances of Providence; it is against the interests of man that immediate reparation should be possible when long-continued evils have been at work, for one of the strongest safeguards against misdoing would be removed if at any moment the consequences of misdoing could be restored. But though immediate reparation be never possible, gradual amelioration is, and we are, withal, to rouse ourselves to duty that gradual amelioration might begin from this very day. To us the golden cross on the summit of this great Cathedral should be like that upon the banners of Constantine which struck terror into the pagan host of Maxentius at the battle of the Milvian Bridge. It should be to summon us to a self-denial which, while it lasts, must never be relaxed. It must be the stimulus to courage which can never wholly be defeated; it must be a pledge of a hope which can never utterly be quenched.

The *Manchester Guardian* says that the parishioners of Marton, near Blackpool, have lodged an objection with the Bishop of Manchester to the effect that the patronage of that advowson is not in the gift of the vicar of Poulton, and that the recent nomination to the living is therefore invalid.

To the Deaf.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By the Ven. W. H. TAYLOR, D.D, LL.D., Archdeacon of Liverpool, and Vicar of St. Chrysostom, Everton, Liverpool.

Sermon Preached in St. Chrysostom's on Sunday, October 13th, 1889.

"Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following."—Psalms xlviii. 12, 13.

I HAVE chosen these words as containing a statement that may be applied to the subject which will occupy our attention this evening—the distinctive principles of the worship of the Church of England. I say they may be applied because they were spoken originally of Jerusalem, God's holy city, and they may be applied still more to the spiritual Zion in the deepest and best sense. But still they do admit of an application to the National Church of this country, and I shall endeavour to make that application. It is astonishing what widely different views are taken on these matters. If we took a hundred people and asked them to give their ideas on the distinctive principles of our Church we should find a great variety indeed. At the present time there is a strong wave of a reactionary character passing over our Church, and it would be well to ask the congregation to consider the real character of our Church. The Church of England is unique amongst the Churches of the West. It occupies a peculiar position and has a peculiar history. It differs from the reformed and unreformed Churches, and by the acknowledgment of all it occupies professedly a very peculiar position. Its past history is a very remarkable one. When we speak of the Church of England, we do not speak of a new Church. Our Church is an historical Church, and has a remarkable history, going back to the remote past, indeed, for many hundreds of years. It goes back to the 4th century, and before that, because some of the British bishops attended a council held in France in 314. Now a Church must have been in existence for a considerable time before in order to be in a position to send bishops to that council. The Church of England is passing through a strange phase at the present time, with which you, my younger friends, will have to deal by-and-bye, and perhaps some elder members also, for events are advancing so rapidly. My object to-night is to give an introductory statement as to this course of sermons, and I must be content with that. Each evening I shall take up some one point in detail. I shall submit my proofs to the intelligence of my hearers, and they must take the responsibility of forming their own judgment; we cannot escape responsibilities. Every day we have to decide upon important matters. The doctor has to take the responsibility of dealing with his patient. Every person engaged in business has to take the responsibility of deciding what is best to be done, and this is so in religion. Every man is responsible for his faith; for a man's faith depends on the evidence given in proof, and the weight of evidence depends on the degree of attention and candour with which it is considered. "I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say"; and again, "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." There is a great want for this exercise at the present. In referring to differences in our own Church, and what it tends to become, I would invite you to look at what has taken place in Wales. There was a grand ceremony at the opening of the recent Church Congress. The opening service was held in a Church where the only difference between it and a Roman Catholic Mass was that it was called a High Celebration. With that exception it could not be distinguishable from the Mass. Twenty-two candles were ablaze on the altar. A figure of the Madonna, a large brazen crucifix, illegal vestments, the wine mixed with water, the eastward position taken. All points which had been condemned were there ostentatiously exhibited. Although the Church was crowded, only three persons received the sacrament. A more shocking outrage to the convictions and feelings of the loyal clergy and people who were present it is impossible to conceive. That, taken in connection with the prosecution of Bishop King, were instances of the direction of the reactionary movement to which I referred. I shall first invite your attention to five distinctive principles wherein we differ for the most part from the unreformed Churches. These two or three features in our polity which distinguish us from other Churches, and in the third place to two or three particulars in the worship of the Church of England. In this it is peculiar and unique.

Now, one of the bulwarks of our Church is the rule of faith, namely, God's own Word. The second point will be the doctrine of our Church on the most important subject of justification. These two principles are the key-notes of the Reformation. One involves to a certain extent the other. The Reformers started upon the principle that whatever was not written in God's Word was not to be received as an article of faith. This principle was applied in the first place to the great doctrine of justification, because that great question for every man anxious about his soul was, How can that man be justified before God. It is important to see what the Word of God says on this subject, and it is for me to put before you what the Word of God declares, and then to reason from it and exercise a judgment upon it.

The third will be a very important principle, namely, the doctrine of the Church, or what the Church really is. The fourth distinctive principle

is that which determines the number and nature of the sacraments. How many are there, what their office design, and also more especially as to the two which the Church still retains. And then the last, the great distinctive principle which separates us from the Church of Rome is that connected with the work of Christ—with the finished work of Christ. These five subjects will suffice to bring before you the important distinctive principles which distinguish and separate us from the unreformed Church of Rome. There are many doctrines and principles upon which we are at one with them, as, for example, those contained in the three creeds.

With regard to the polity of the Church, there are two aspects—first, the Ecclesiastical; and secondly, the Civil. The Government of our Church is Episcopal, which distinguishes it from our Nonconformist brethren, as well as in a sense from the Romanists. We believe in the antiquity, in the propriety of three orders of the Christian ministry — Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. That distinguishes us from the Papacy and from the Presbyterian form of government and the Congregationalists. We think Episcopacy is nearer the primitive form than that which is observed by others. Then we have also a civil point of view in which to regard it. Our Church is an Established Church—it is a National Church. It brings in the civil element, and the clerical is controlled by the civil power, but as the chief rulers of the civil power are also members of the Church, it follows that the Church is governed by its own members. But here we come to a very important point, which divides us from those who object in principle to a National Church, and they think it is wrong. Sooner or later the question will have to be dealt with. It has come up in connection with the Church of Ireland, and has resulted in disestablishment, and it will have to be dealt with in Wales and in Scotland. But let us not go on drifting without knowing whither we are going. Let us understand the question. Let us look before us and realise what effect it will have upon the Church itself, spiritually and ecclesiastically. I have chosen as the third division of our general subject, our distinctive worship, which distinguishes us again both from Rome and Nonconformists. It distinguishes us because our services are not only liturgical but vernacular. Our service is in the English language. In the Latin services the people cannot take part in them. They do not understand the words. If they take part, it must be by means of a translation. For the most part they are but listeners. They are observers of what is going on, but it is not such an intelligent interest in the service which we can take. We have the book before us, and every word is in the vernacular of the people, and it is thoroughly scriptural, and it is spiritual in addition. Amongst other elements it is thoroughly evangelical, and brings out those grand truths in a wonderful way. The service is rendered by the congregation, not by the choir. It must be congregational. That is the distinctive feature of our Church. The service of the Nonconformists is not liturgical, it keeps the people silent during the service. The prayers and responses are not there. When a man is preaching or praying the people are taking no part in the service. They can sing a hymn and that is all, the remainder is a mere silent service as far as they are concerned. I am ready to admit the excellencies in others, but when I have done I hope you will be able to see what our distinctive principles really are.

We shall walk about Zion and tell the towers thereof, and by-and-bye we shall mark her bulwarks and consider her palaces and enjoy the riches we find there, and we will thank God for the privileges we have, and we are determined by God's blessing to hand down all these blessings to our children; and when we elders have passed away to join the great Church triumphant above, we will leave our children behind to worship God in the same simple way that we have done, and to transmit the blessings that we have given to them to those who follow after. I have said you are living in anxious times, and it is one of the first conditions to understand what the Church really is, and then to decide what is right and best to do. I do invite you not to let things drift without making some effort to stop the tide of error. The present state of things is calculated to give serious thought. How long will this continue? I do not think it will be very long. We shall have an awakening up of the national mind to the inconsistencies of what is going on in the National Church, and the results may be serious to the institutions both of Church and State.

SOCIALISM IN THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

By the Rev. JOHN SHEPHARD, M.A., Vicar of Eton.

Sermon Preached in Eton Parish Church, on Sunday, December 8th, 1889.

I NEED make no apology for introducing the subject of Socialism when it is being discussed by newspapers and magazines and at meetings of all kinds. It is the duty of all thoughtful Christians to consider it in the light of Christian principles, and the province of ministers to try to show how far such movements should have active support and sympathy. It is not easy to give a plain answer to the question "What is Socialism?" The word is used in so many different senses that misconceptions are almost unavoidable. Then Socialism itself has taken so many different shapes and forms. There is the Socialism of Russia, France, Germany and England, and a wide difference

between the Socialism of to-day and of a few years ago. These constant shiftings and changes create a difficulty in the way of clear explanation and definition. There are Socialists who insist upon Communism, that is on all giving up private property and throwing it in a common stock in which all share and share alike. They advocate the doctrine of complete equality, and doing away with all distinction of rank and class. Some Socialists are Revolutionists, Nihilists, Anarchists, anxious to upset all government and effect their ends by undisguised murder and robbery. The central aim of other Socialists is to reform Society, to improve mankind and the moral condition of the poor, to raise the toiling masses from degradation and misery by teaching them to combine and work together for their common interest, and if possible to bring together into closer union the wage-earning population and owners of property. No doubt Socialism has risen as a reaction against individualism—against a system in which each individual looks only to himself and studies his own interest and cares for none but himself. It rebels against a system under which the strong have their own way and the weakest go to the wall. It advocates the good of Society as distinct from private or class interests. Is there ground for this? All thoughtful men must admit that Society is not in a sound condition. Many toilers have been cruelly oppressed. There are too many underpaid and overworked, and under hard and grasping masters who squeeze profits out of the sweat and blood of their fellow-creatures. There are, too, many owners of property ignoring the necessities of their tenants, while they themselves are clothed in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously. The question may be asked, "Is this movement so far in accord with Holy Scripture?" I answer that Isaiah and Micah spoke strongly against selfish oppression, and no one denounces selfishness on the part of the rich in more withering terms than St. James. Our Lord refers to the ruler and the judge, and warns the rich against grasping covetousness and selfish neglect of the poor and needy. Moreover the principle of brotherhood is thoroughly Scriptural. It was proclaimed by Moses, and woven into his legislation, and is enforced again and again in the New Testament. So far Christianity and Socialism agrees. It is clear that the latter has drawn its best inspiration from the Bible, and it is the fault of Christians not of Christianity that these truths have been forgotten. At the same time if this great movement is to prove the lever to raise Society, and help to create a reign of righteousness and brotherly love, certain conditions under which they can be realised must not be overlooked. People must distinguish in what is called progress, between what is false and what is true, evil and good, and take especial care that the means used to bring about improvement are just and right. The danger must be guarded against of the movement becoming too narrow, because many Socialists speak as if only the interests of the wage-earning class were to be studied, and that it did not matter what became of the rest. Holy Scripture does not teach us this exclusive view. It teaches us that each individual is part of the great whole of life, that due regard should be shown to all, and all alike, in order to bring about the welfare and the happiness of all. There are too many attacks directed solely against rich capitalists and wealthy traders, as if they were the only persons responsible. What about those who in all classes of life go from shop to shop to purchase the cheapest articles? Does not this practice of seeking after cheap goods incite the competition of petty dealers and encourage the cruel slavery of sweating? In this respect very few hands are clean. We are all guilty. The Christian Church can approve of the central aim of Socialism and give it the deepest sympathy, but it cannot support those who meet injustice with injustice. It can form no alliance with those who would cure the wrongs of the poor by robbing and spoiling the rich, by taking from others, by violence, or even by force of law, their private property. Robbery, pillage, and confiscation will never make happy men or a prosperous nation. Any attempt to establish a reign of equality by force must, sooner or later, break down and only drive the evil deeper. True Christian Socialism should aim at improvement from within, helped by measures from without. The law may limit individual freedom where it is hurtful to the community at large, and enforce equal justice to all without respect of persons. It may protect men from being ground into the dust under the wheel of competition, or plundered by unscrupulous middlemen. The State may interfere with certain forms of Trade and make abuses difficult. But we can never abolish selfishness by Acts of Parliament, and never get rid of crying wrongs by forcible measures from without. Any such attempt will only produce greater disaster. The robbery of property will crush a natural instinct which is the chief incentive to labour, break the mainspring of human progress, and hamstring the sinews of industry and exertion. If all were levelled down to-day inequalities would soon reassert themselves. If all the poor were made rich, and palaces were given them, in many cases these palaces would soon become dens of misery and filth. Improved circumstances will not effect great changes unless there is improvement from within. We must care for people's souls as well as their bodies; to get rid of poverty we must get rid of degrading tastes; and to drive lazy shufflers into honest and diligent working we must fill them with higher motives and nobler aims. Socialism without Christianity is a vain dream. It is ignoring man's true nature and his relation with God, who made him. True changes can not be effected suddenly. This is a point that Socialism is in danger of losing sight of. It is hard to be

patient in the presence of wrongs, but we must be governed by experience. In this respect we can all be useful. We all go to make up the moral tone of a nation, and can all protest against what is un-Christian. Is not Society so corrupt because Christ's principles have been forgotten? His power, if brought to bear on the rich, teaches responsibility, that property is a trust to be administered for the good of humanity, as a means of helping others to blessing. On the other hand, Christianity teaches the poor to rise by thrift and honesty, by self-respect and self-control, and sobriety, and not to be ashamed to show themselves Christians. Christianity teaches the trading classes to be true and just in all their dealings, to maintain Christian principles of honesty, in spite of the temptations of fierce competition, to be considerate and thoughtful for the homes and families of their *employés*, to share with faithful workpeople the profits of their common labour, so that they may all rejoice together, and bridge over the inevitable differences and inequalities by wide and loving sympathy, and feeling a common interest in a common good.

A PROPOSAL has been set on foot amongst the clergy of Derby for free marriages, in order to counteract the increasing tendency to civil marriages indicated in the Registrar-General's returns.

THE Rev. Arthur S. Valpy, rector of Holy Trinity with St. Mary's, Guilford, writes to say that the statement that he has received the offer of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, is absolutely without foundation.

ACCORDING to the *Manchester Guardian*, the Rev. C. Townson has declined the request of certain parishioners of St. Paul's, Farington, Preston, who have asked him to withdraw as vicar in favour of the Rev. J. H. Barnett, curate-in-charge.

THE *Standard* says that Dr. Parry's resignation of his Suffragan's Commission took effect on Tuesday last, but he will still retain the title of Bishop of Dover, and continue to hold the office of Canon and Archdeacon of Canterbury. "Before the appointment of his successor is completed the Primate will petition the Crown for permission to adopt either of the two additional Suffragan 'sees' conferred upon the diocese by a recent Act—namely, Croydon and Maidstone."

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1890.

CLEANLINESS.—No. II.

IF the skin has such an important influence on health as we endeavoured to point out last week, it should receive as much care and attention as any other organ of the body; perhaps more, because, unlike other organs, Nature has placed it within our ken, and under our direct supervision. We are, however, pretty confident that with nine-tenths of the population the reverse is the case. Even professed valetudinarians have a solicitous care for their brains, hearts, lungs, livers, and stomachs, and often none at all for their skins. If they had this care, and would occasionally resort to a hot soap and water bath, or to a Turkish bath, it would do more to disperse their mischievous forebodings and imaginary ailments than all the resources of the Pharmacopœia, for which they have such a craving.

The Turkish bath is, of course, a most potent agent for cleansing the pores and surface of the skin, but it also does more, it cleanses and washes out the blood itself, and in the hands of a skilful and experienced physician is a valuable remedy for many blood diseases, as well as for congestions of the internal organs. Inasmuch, however, as it is a powerful remedy, and liable to be misapplied, it should only be had recourse to under medical direction.

The more common and sufficiently sure way to cleanse the skin is with plenty of hot water and soap. Among the better classes the face and hands are well cared for, but it is not always so easy to keep the whole body clean; indeed, the difficulties are sometimes insuperable. Few houses are well provided with hot and cold water and a convenient

bath-room. In most small houses neglect of personal cleanliness is pardonable, although of late great improvements have been made in the large towns, and many houses rented at from £20 to £40 a year are provided with every facility for full ablutions. To ensure thorough cleanliness the whole body ought to be frequently immersed in warm water, and vigorously scrubbed with a good brush and plenty of soap. Cold water, abundant enough in most houses, gives too great a shock to make its use a general favourite, although a vigorous constitution and long custom make cold water as pleasant as warm. Warm water, which never injures any one, is not always obtainable in sufficient quantities. Wherever practicable a bath ought to be part of the household furniture, and to be in frequent requisition. When a mother is reduced to the necessity of using a small foot-pan for the weekly ablutions, her unfortunate children learn to look with horror on the uncomfortable process of being scrubbed with plenty of soap but little water, and in later life retain the dislike to a bath which their mother's poverty implanted. Few large towns are so unfortunate as not to be supplied with public baths, and although these baths are occasionally used by the working classes, the importance of frequently resorting to them is not generally understood. For purposes of cleanliness a warm bath at least ten or twelve times a year is indispensable. Were this done it would prevent many a cold, many an illness, and many a death. The poor let years pass without cleansing the whole body, and in the Irish quarters of large towns it is the exception to meet with persons who have had one good warm bath in their whole lives.

A warm bath should have a temperature ranging from 90° to 100° Fahr. The best rule, however, is that the water should be warm enough to give a pleasant feeling—nothing more. Twenty minutes is not too long to remain in the water, and the free use of soap should not be forgotton. When possible a bath, warm or cold, according to taste and habit, two or three times a week, is of great service, especially to persons who do not take much exercise. In the morning immediately on leaving one's bed a cold bath in the summer, and a cold douche over the body in winter, is a capital and bracing tonic. A brief immersion in, or douche of, cold water is most useful for the power it gives of resisting exposure to cold and damp, but it is not sufficient to keep the body clean. When any one resolves to form the habit of immersing or douching himself every morning it is better not to persevere if the feeling of chilliness, which contact with cold water induces, lasts after the body is thoroughly dried, because if the body does not soon get warm and comfortable, injury rather than good may result.

Manual labour and exercise, especially when they cause sweating, promote cleanliness of the skin, and, what is of more importance to the race as well as to the individual, cleanliness of the blood. In our large towns, where this labour and exercise is not easy to obtain, the practice of swimming becomes of special value. It is a delightful and healthy exercise for both sexes, calling into play the muscles of the body, while thoroughly cleansing the pores of the skin. It is an accomplishment, which all who have the opportunity, should master. Being able to swim has saved thousands of lives, and those who can swim may, with safety, indulge in boating and yachting—amusements that yearly cost hundreds of lives which might, with some knowledge of swimming, have been long preserved.

It will be apparent to our readers, from what we have said concerning the functions of the skin, that attention to its cleanliness is a most important safeguard against many kinds of diseases, and is more or less an alleviation to every disease. That painful and at times fatal complaint, painter's colic or lead poisoning—caused by the absorption of lead—is better prevented by frequent warm baths and careful washing of the hands and face before every meal than by anything else. Many unpleasant skin eruptions are absolutely prevented, easily relieved, or actually cured by cleanliness; while warm baths and Turkish baths frequently and regularly taken are invaluable in chronic rheumatism, gout, and some other complaints. We conclude, therefore, that attention to cleanliness increases strength of mind and body, promotes comfort, and wards off disease.

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT.

SINCE the death of General Gordon, no loss which this country has sustained has excited such wide and deep concern as the death of Bishop Lightfoot. In both cases, although there had been a long period of anxiety and suspense, yet the catastrophe, when it did come, came as a shock; and everyone, as he heard the grievous news, knew that the nation had become suddenly poorer. It was poorer by the loss of one of those treasures which are precious just in proportion to their extreme rarity, the lives of really great men. Bishop Lightfoot's right to be reckoned among such will not be questioned by any of those—and they may be counted by thousands—who have had the happiness and the responsibility of coming under his immediate influence. And it is this fact which makes the sorrow for his death so widespread and profound. Besides the general public, which is well aware of the national loss, and the better instructed, who recognise that the calamity is one which extends to the whole of Christendom, there are multitudes who, while knowing all this feel, and feel acutely, that the loss to themselves is a personal one. A permanent element of strength, a permanent source of delight, has gone out of their lives; and they do not see how it is to be replaced.

The greatness of the Bishop consisted in the rare combination, and still more rare balance, of a variety of gifts, any one of which might have made a remarkable man. Philosophic breadth of view and scientific grasp of principles were united with an inexhaustible

capacity for taking pains about details. His intense enthusiasm rarely biassed his judgment, and never betrayed him into precipitancy. He had the exactness, without the one-sidedness, of a man of science; the calmnesss, without the coldness, of a judge. His learning, which was immense, was entirely free from pedantry; and his scholarship was both finished and strong. He had a command of material which would have made the construction of brilliant theories easy to him; but to his intellectual honesty everything was unattractive which could not be based upon ascertained truth.

It was as a scholar that he first made his mark—a mark which will never be effaced. Short as his life has been, and enormous as have been the inroads made upon his time, he has produced works which, if distributed, would have made the lasting reputation of several men. The *Ignatian Epistles*, a work for the thorough accomplishment of which he learnt two languages, would have made any man famous; so also would the commentaries on St. Paul. How much equally precious material, ready for publication in the eyes of any one less thorough than himself, is in existence, we have yet to learn. Not one of his works, however, is popular, or ever will be: their merit is of a far higher order. They are part of the indispensable outfit of every theological student.

As a theologian he was among the first to take up fearlessly, and the one to take up most effectively, the challenge to "treat the Bible like any other book." Dr. Lightfoot not only accepted the terms; he insisted on their being kept. "Treating the Bible like any other book" must not be allowed to mean treating the Bible as no other book was ever yet treated. Evidence must not be dismissed as invalid and inadequate, which in any other case would be accepted as strong and abundant; nor must every difficulty in detail be taken as equivalent to disproof of the whole. He was persuaded that the Bible, like every other form of truth, has nothing to fear from scientific criticism. Diocletian aimed at starving Christianity to death by destroying the sacred writings from which it is fed. Modern scepticism would compass the same end by raising critical doubts as to the authenticity of the writings. Both have failed; and the failure in the latter case has been due to no man more than to Dr. Lightfoot, at any rate so far as the New Testament is concerned. He has proved, and has trained scores of other scholars to prove, that the most searching criticism is nothing but gain to religious truth. It frees us from what is questionable, and establishes still more indisputably those great words and facts upon which Christianity is based.

Nor do the Bishop's services as a theologian end here. He has taught us all that controversy about the most momentous subjects, and with the most perverse and wrong-headed objectors, may be carried on without recrimination or bitterness. He never, however strong his case, brow-beats or derides an opponent; for his aim is, not victory, but the truth. He probably never had an enemy: he certainly never made one.

The reason of this was that his great intellectual powers were chastened, enriched, and intensified by moral qualities still greater. His abilities and acquirements excite our admiration; but it is his character that we revere and love. It seems almost a profanation to attempt to dissect it. Sincerity, sympathy, and simplicity best sum it up. In all he said and did, his intense honesty and reality were conspicuous, and also his consideration for others. Besides which, he had a gentleness and a freedom from self-consciousness which were inexpressibly touching. Accustomed to wrestle successfully with the intellectual giants of the century, and occupying one of the highest positions in the English Church, he quite naturally, and without the slightest air of condescension, took the attitude of an equal with those who conversed with him. It was these qualities, even more than his royal intellectual powers, which made him such a leader of men. Cambridge and Durham undergraduates and tutors—London men of business, lawyers, and statesmen; North-country pitmen, artizans, and clergy—have all felt the stimulus and attraction of his magnetic personality. It was at once a lesson and a delight to listen to him; a gain and an honour to follow him. He was never an orator; at St. Paul's he was the Canon "who could write a sermon, but could not preach one;" but when he became a Bishop, and was obliged to appear on platforms, by sheer force of purpose he made himself an impressive speaker. Yet he was followed mainly because of his transparent rectitude and fairness. His aims were high, and his methods never mean. Men felt that they could trust him.

It was on January 28th, 1879, that it was publicly announced that the sovereign had nominated him, while still in priests orders, to the great see of Durham. It was remarked that in the First Lesson for that day a sovereign says to Joseph, "There is none so discreet or wise as thou: thou shalt be over my house" (Gen. xli. 39). "None so discreet or wise." With these simple words we take leave of him; and, as we lay his body in its last resting-place, there is but one feeling that can equal our sorrow—gratitude that our lives have been ennobled by contact with such a life as his. —*The Durham Chronicle.*

MRS. TURNER, of Westfield, Horton, has distributed the following benefactions made under the will of her son, the late Rev. John Turner, in addition to those mentioned in our last issue:—C.M.S., £6,700; S.P.C.K., £4,500; Navvy Mission Society, £2,200.

THE Prince of Wales and the Duke of Edinburgh have consented to become patrons of the Rev. John Lister Knight's fund for restoring Burnham Thorpe Church, where Nelson used to attend Divine worship as a child, and where his father and mother are buried.

THE church of Little Comberton, at the foot of Bredon Hill, is remarkable for its low Norman nave, its handsome early Tudor tower, and its late Tudor chancel, of equal length and width with the nave, and with its roof rising ten feet above the roof of the latter. In this space, or west wall, four little windows were pierced, when a new chancel arch of oak was introduced at the late restoration in place of a beam of elm. These windows have now been filled with stained glass representing angels, two of them swinging censors to represent "Prayer," and other two representing "Praise," one playing a harp, the other cymbals. They are from the studio of Mr. W. Pearce, of Birmingham, and are the gift of an anonymous donor. A lady parishioner has also presented two clock-faces to the clock in the tower as a thankoffering for the recent rural Mission there held. A third present was received just before Christmas, also from a lady connected with the parish—a white pulpit frontal.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"PERFECTLY ABSURD."

SIR,—When, a few weeks ago, Mr. Sandlands declared it to be puerile and absurd to suppose that he meant to exclude other methods by saying that we are shut up to one, it seemed to me that it was scarcely possible for a controversialist to advance further in the ways of unreason. In his answer, however, to "J. B." in your current number he takes a fresh stride onward and surpasses his previous record. The feat he achieves is so instructive as a warning that I hope to be allowed to analyse it briefly.

The question in debate concerns the day of grace for sinful men and its final issues. There are two theories. According to one, each man's day of grace ends with his death, and for those who in this brief earthly life fail to profit by it, there remains nothing but everlasting loss and pain. According to the other, the day of grace, begun here, extends on indefinitely into the world beyond the grave, and will not cease until the divine love has prevailed to rescue every soul from the bondage of sin, and brought it into eternal harmony with God. Whatever may be thought of the merits of these theories, neither of them is in the least degree irrational or absurd. They are both coherent and self-consistent. Both of them have a certain amount of support in Scripture. To both of them some of our spiritual instincts or intuitions respond. Both of them have been held in the best times of the Church by saintly and powerful minds. On which side the weightier mass of evidence lies is a fair subject of debate, even though the conclusion be that the matter is still bound up with the hidden mysteries of God.

Of these two theories "J. B." has come to embrace the latter, and condenses it into this form: "God purposes to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, holy, and happy immortality through processes of a most momentous nature, which take place during *aions* or ages." If the present period of grace, the time of man's terrestrial life, be numbered among these ages, the statement fairly covers the ground of the theory.

Now, it is quite open to Mr. Sandlands to adduce arguments to discredit this theory, and show that the balance of evidence is in favour of the other. That, however, he declines to do, and prefers by a few off-hand words to show that "J. B.'s" statement of his theory is "perfectly absurd," and "without sense or reason." And this is how he proceeds:—

First, "The statement," he says, "implies that many men will depart this life unhappy. This is contrary to experience"; and, secondly, it "implies that many men leave this world with a desire to be made happy. This is contrary to experience." Now, would any one easily believe that neither of these alleged implications has any place whatever in the impugned statement? It says nothing at all about dying unhappy, or desiring to be happy—never even hints at such facts. What it implies is that many die *unprepared for a safe, holy, and happy immortality*. I cannot imagine that even Mr. Sandlands would venture to deny that sad fact, and it is that alone which is the basis of the statement. Even if men generally die in a state of indifference to the future, which is very questionable, they certainly none the less would need the work of grace on their benumbed and ignorant souls. So far, then, the assault is a discharge of blank cartridges—noise, and nothing else.

Mr. Sandlands objects, thirdly, that "the statement implies that the Atonement has no power to make men happy." What in the world does this mean? The Atonement, as a bare fact, makes no one happy; it is the basis of all those processes of the divine grace by which men are brought to repentance, faith, and holiness, and are thus made meet for eternal happiness. Both theories equally recognise this, and "J. B.'s" statement contains not a shadow of implication to the contrary. In fact, it is his theory which magnifies the Atonement far more than the other. In the other the Atonement has no efficacy for any who die impenitent beyond the grave, but in this its efficacy extends into the ages to come, and finally prevails over sin and death, and completes the reconciliation of all to the Eternal Father.

As for the fourth objection, that "the statement is nowhere revealed," it merely means that Mr. Sandlands differs in opinion from "J. B." It no more proves the absurdity of the latter's statement than it proves the superiority of the opposite theory.

Enough of this, your readers will say, and I heartily agree by anticipation.

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—I find some remarks in the PULPIT of this date on statements of my own which appeared on the 14th inst. They seem to me irrelevant and illogical, although I suppose I must be mistaken, as they are written by a clergyman who does not hesitate to speak in most positive terms, and not unfrequently uses the epithet *absurd* in relation to what his opponents say.

The view I have endeavoured to bring forward is, that the Scheme of Redemption through Christ, including the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the potent influences of the Holy Spirit, is declared in the Holy Scriptures to have full and adequate resources for the instruction, correction, and moral transformation of all the intelligent creatures of God.

When I read that it is God's purpose "having made peace through the blood of His Cross to reconcile all things unto Himself," I feel the most undoubting confidence in the accomplishment of that purpose. When I see clearly that only a small part of the children of Adam are reconciled to God in this life, I feel an equally strong assurance that there are suitable measures for carrying on that beneficent, God-like object in a future life. The texts relating to the punishment of sin must be interpreted so as to harmonise with those grand illimitable, all-embracing designs; and I regard such punishments as intended and adapted to promote the welfare of the whole universe.

I believe such opinions are now held by a large number of intelligent persons.

J. B.

Canonbury, December 28th, 1889.

ST. JOHN VI.

SIR,—In reply to your correspondent, Edmund Lawrence, I beg to ask him what he means by the words "the Bread which came down from Heaven"?

Does he say that "My Flesh," which our Lord calls "the Bread which I will give for the life of the world," is the same as "I am the living Bread?" If he does, where, I ask, is the difference between the Godhead and Manhood of Christ, in other words, His Divinity and Humanity?

Mr. Edmund Lawrence says that my explanation favours transubstantiation; but, as he says also, that I speak like a Quaker, this is consolatory, as one cannot well verge to both poles at once. But how do such criticisms avail? The question is, Did our Lord's Flesh come down from heaven? If it did not, what is the use of saying that the truth leads here or there? When Mr. Edmund Lawrence has said all he can, do not the facts remain the same? The bread that came down from heaven was not our Lord's Flesh, and His Flesh that He gave for the life of the world did not come down from heaven. These are two positions which no grandiloquent language can overturn.

INQUIRENS.

THOSE confirmations in the diocese of Canterbury which have been appointed to be taken by the Bishop-Suffragan of Dover before Easter will be taken by Bishop Mitchinson, to whom communications may be addressed at Sibstone Rectory, Atherstone.

THE loss which the Church has suffered by the death of the Bishop of Durham has been specially felt in the University of Cambridge, where he resided so long. The special service in Trinity College chapel, which took place simultaneously with the funeral at Durham, was thronged by a crowd of mourners. The service was adapted from the Burial Service, and included the hymns "The King of love," and "For all the saints who from their labours rest."

A COMMENCEMENT has been made with the work of the Mission established in connection with the Merchant Taylors' School. The Rev. W. A. Buck, an old Merchant Taylor, has been appointed Missioner, his sphere of labours being the Shacklewell district of West Hackney, the incumbent of which is also an "old boy."—*City Press.*

ARCHDEACON BLAKENEY, vicar of Sheffield and Rural Dean, received a letter on Tuesday last from the Lord Chamberlain stating that the Queen intended to confer upon him the office of Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty. The vacancy has been caused by the resignation of the Hon. and Rev. Francis Byng. Dr. Blakeney has been one of Her Majesty's honorary chaplains since 1886. He has signified his intention to accept the offer.—*Times.*

AMONG the deacons ordained at the recent ordination of the Bishop of Rochester was Dr. Megarry, LL.D. Dublin, D.C.L. Durham, recently the pastor of the Wesleyan Chapel, Eastbourne.

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have transferred all the endowments, emoluments, etc., of the old parish church of St. Paul's, Shireshead, Garstang, to the new parish church of St. James's, Shireshead, recently consecrated.

DR. M. J. MONK, F.C.O., has been appointed organist and choir-master of Truro Cathedral, vice Dr. Sinclair, who proceeds to Hereford. There were 120 applicants. Dr. Monk was connected with York Minster for eleven years, first as chorister for five years, and subsequently as articled pupil and deputy to Dr. E. G. Monk for six years. He has for the last seven years been organist and choir-master of Banbury.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Armstrong, Rev. Alfred, Curate of Holy Trinity, Ipswich; Curate-in-Charge of Holy Trinity, Bungay.

Dickson, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Curate; Incumbent of Christ Church, Waterloo, Liverpool.

Doran, Rev. John Wilberforce, M.A., Rector of Souldern, Oxon.

Edersheim, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate of Kegworth, Leicestershire; Vicar of Blaisdon, Gloucestershire.

Grove, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Secretary to the S.P.C.K.; Vicar of Cliffe-at-Hoo, Kent.

Heaver, Rev. T. Teed, late Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester; Curate-in-Charge of Dunston, Norwich.

Hilton, Rev. Giles, M.A., Rector of Daglingworth, Gloucestershire.

Hughes, Rev. H., Vicar of St. Paul's, Clapham.

Kirkby, Rev. John, B.A., Vicar of Santon, Isle of Man.

Law, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Rotherham; Chaplain of the Rotherham Workhouse.

Miller, Rev. E. F., M.A., Warden of St. Thomas's College, Colombo; Archdeacon of Colombo.

Palmer, Rev. Edward H., Curate of St. Mary's, Hunslet; Vicar of New Wortley, Leeds,

Roome, Rev. W. E., M.A., Curate; Rector of Revelstoke, Devonshire.

Sharp, Rev. B. Oswald, A.K.C., Vicar of St. Peter's, Clerkenwell; Vicar of St. John's, Potter's-bar, Barnet.

Sundius-Smith, Rev. C. M., M.A., Senior Curate of Great Driffield; Vicar of Lund-with-Kilnwick, Hull.

Vernon, Rev. Edward Hamilton, Rector of Jackfield, Salop.

Walley, Rev. Stephen C., M.A., Curate of Seghill, Northumberland; Vicar of Warmfield (or Kirkthorpe), Wakefield.

Wauton, Rev. A. E., M.A., Curate of Northill; Vicar of Ivinghoe, Buckinghamshire.

Waugh, Rev. Francis Gledstanes, M.A., Vicar of Moulsford, Berks.

Whalley, Rev. George C., Incumbent of Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Vicar of Warmfield, or Kirkthorpe, Wakefield.

White, Rev. Henry, M.A., Chaplain of the Chapel Royal, Savoy; Chaplain to the House of Commons.

Wilkins, Rev. W. H., M.A., Curate of St. Botolph's, Billingsgate; Clerical Secretary for the County of London of the Church of England Burial Reform Association.

Wilkinson, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Vicar of Ratley, Warwickshire.

Williamson, Rev. F. J., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Bartholomew's, Westhoughton; Curate-in-Charge of St. Leonard's, Padiham, Burnley.

Williams, Rev. H. Alban, M.A., Curate of St. John's, Wimbledon; Choral Chaplain at Christ Church, Oxford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bland, Rev. William Handley, Vicar of Braceby-with-Sapperton, at Braceby Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 82.

Chancellor, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, and Rural Dean, at St. John's Vicarage, Derby, on the 22nd ult., aged 59.

Coke, Rev. John Henry, Rector of Ropsley, at Elstow, Exeter, on Christmas Eve, aged 78.

Hicks, Rev. James, B.A., formerly Vicar of Pydeltrenthide, Dorset, at Alnwick, Northumberland, on the 28th ult., in his 80th year.

Purves, Rev. John, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, at Oakbank, Tullypowrie, Perthshire, on the 20th ult.

Rogers, Rev. William, at Mawnan Sanctuary, near Falmouth, on the 28th ult., aged 72.

The Church of England Pulpit.

WORSHIPPING THE RISEN LORD.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral.

"Behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail! And they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him."—Matthew xxviii. 9.

THIS is a continuation of St. Matthew's account, which began with the visit of Mary Magdalene and her companions to the tomb of our Lord, and which we were considering on Easter-day. We left these holy women listening to the angel who was addressing them as he sat on the great stone which had been rolled inside the first or outer chamber of the sepulchre. The angel, you will remember, invited them to "Come, see the place where the Lord lay"; but he also told them to "Go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead." Now, this last command, apparently, was only addressed to the companions of Mary Magdalene. It would seem that Mary Magdalene herself, on seeing that the tomb was opened, had at once set out to inform St. Peter and St. John that some unfriendly hands had taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre. These two Apostles thereupon visited the sepulchre in the manner which St. John has described at length, while Mary herself followed them, and met our Lord Himself in the garden. When, then, Mary had set off on this her errand, her companions first entered the tomb, and then, in obedience to the bidding of the angel, went out of it quickly with fear and great joy, and ran to tell the news to the disciples generally. It is probable that instead of entering Jerusalem by the gate that was certainly close to Mount Calvary, they made their way for some distance outside, so as to enter the city by another gate further removed from the scene of the Crucifixion, so that in this way they might escape unwelcome notice. Their path would have led close under the walls, and as they followed it with such speed as they could command, they were suddenly brought to a stand: "Jesus met them, saying, All hail!" He must very shortly before have appeared in the garden of the sepulchre to Mary Magdalene, as she had now returned to the sepulchre after the two disciples, and had mistaken Him for the gardener until she recognised His voice. Now, He seemed to be coming to her companions from an opposite direction to that in which they were walking, the truth being that the new conditions of the Resurrection Body made His movements thus independent of time and distance, and so He met them under the city walls with the greeting of "All hail! and they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him."

Now, this second appearance of our Lord after His Resurrection to the companions of Mary Magdalene may seem at first sight to be one of the least moment of those recorded in the Gospels, yet it has lessons to teach us which may well occupy our thoughts this afternoon.

And, first, there is the question, not, therefore, irreverent, even if it cannot be answered with certainty, why our Lord should have appeared to this particular group of women at all. They were not persons of the first importance among His followers; they did not comprise His blessed mother, or His great penitent, Mary Magdalene. They were not like Simon Peter or St. James, called to leadership in his future kingdom; they did not represent anxious inquiry, like the disciples on the Emmaus road; or earnest and perplexed counsels, like the disciples in the upper chamber; or the matter of numbers, like the five hundred in Galilee; they had neither personal authority, nor high office, nor representative weight to recommend them. Why should our Lord have appeared to them? The answer to this question is probably to be found in His words to them, which are, in fact, an endorsement, almost a repetition, of the words of the angel at the sepulchre. As the angel had said: "Go quickly, and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead, and, lo! He goeth before you into Galilee—there shall ye see Him," so our Lord, presenting Himself as actually risen, said: "Fear not; go tell My brethren that they depart into Galilee—there shall they see Me." It would seem, therefore, that our Lord appeared to confirm by His personal authority the command of the angel at the sepulchre, and to bless the holy women for having obeyed it. Yes, we may dare to say it: He appeared to them because they were engaged in the performance of unwelcome duty. Their errand was not without danger. It was dangerous to be associated, in however subordinate a capacity, with the discredited cause of the Prophet of Nazareth. Still they went; their hearts clung to the empty tomb; they would fain have stopped there; but they were bidden to go and bear the message to the disciples. So they went. They did not know how they would be received; they might be repelled as the weak victims of a palpable imposture or illusion. Still they went, and because of their simple, brave, unhesitating obedience Jesus put on them an honour which He withheld elsewhere—He appeared to them before He appeared to any apostle; He appeared to them immediately after His appearance to Mary Magdalene. He repeated the angel's order, to show that it was indeed His own, and His appearance assured them

that in obeying it they had gained more than would have been the case had they followed their own inclination by remaining at the sepulchre. And thus we see one of the conditions under which our Lord is wont now, as of old, to visit human souls. He visits them sometimes when they are in deep sorrow, as He did Mary Magdalene; or in great perplexity, as the disciples on the Emmaus road; or in hours of solitude, as St. Peter and St. James; or at times of anxious consultation, as the disciples in the upper chamber, or even during the strenuous performance of everyday and common duties, like the fisherman on the Sea of Galilee; or even when gathered in multitudes by some common religious enthusiasm, as the five hundred in Galilee; but especially does He visit them when they are doing, from a sense of duty to God, that which runs counter to natural tastes and dispositions. Obedience in circumstances of difficulty is often a time of the highest spiritual illumination. The soul sees more clearly into the world beyond the veil when the will is making a real effort to obey a known law of truth or of duty. As our Lord Himself said, "If any man will do His will he shall know of the doctrine"; and He set His seal on this promise by appearing to the women who to the best of their power and knowledge were doing His will. The possession of great personal gifts, of high office in the Church, of prominence of any sort or kind, personal or official, is in no wise necessary to this high distinction. The promise runs: "Them that are weak, shall He guide in judgment, and such as are gentle, them shall He lead in His way." These poor and humble women were, indeed, the forerunners of a great company of souls whom Christ our Lord has been wont in every age of our Church to meet as they toil along the unfrequented paths of irksome and painful duty. He meets them, cheering them with His smile of encouragement and benediction, saying to their inmost spirits: "All hail!"

Jesus met them. How did they receive Him? The fear and great joy with which they had come out of the sepulchre must surely now have been intensified—fear, for here beyond question was He who was so lately a tenant of the tomb, who had traversed the unseen world, the world of the dead; and great joy, for here was indisputable proof of the truth of the angel message, "He is risen." He was here Himself—the same figure, the same form; the same gracious countenance, lately marred and bruised, now lighted up with an unearthly radiance; the pierced hands, the pierced feet. Their hearts must have echoed to those words of the prophet, "Lo! this is our Lord; we have waited for Him, He will save us." But what did they do? "They came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him."

Now, there are three features of this action of these humble and deeply religious women that are especially deserving of our attention.

And, first of all, that which is admirable in them is their forgetfulness of themselves. "Jesus met them, and they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him." He had been everything to them, as to others, before His crucifixion; they had felt, at least as much as others, the blighted hopes, the wounded affections, the shame, the confusion, the all but despair of the day of Calvary; they had gone through experiences of alternate light and darkness, of hope and fear, of weakness and resolution, of trust in God and something like total despondency—experiences, at least, as varied, as absorbing, as interesting, as distracting as any that we can easily imagine. They meet Jesus suddenly, without preparation, without warning, and forthwith they come and hold Him by the feet and worship Him. It was enough for them that He was there, that He had broken in some way the bars and fetters of the grave; and, exulting in the joy of His victory, they had not thought for themselves. "They came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him." Now, had they been modern Christians, such as we all of us must have known, such as perhaps we are some of us ourselves, they would, we may surmise, have acted differently; they would have insisted, first of all, on telling their Master all that they themselves had gone through since they last saw Him; they would have assured Him that if He had suffered much for them, they had suffered scarcely less from their sympathy with Him; all their anxiety on the night of the betrayal, all their indignation, their grief, their horror on the day of Calvary, all their deep gloom and anguish, their all but hopelessness through the great Sabbath while He rested in the grave, would have been set forth and displayed at length before Him. If they had felt for Him they would see to it that He, too, should not only feel, but should express His feelings for them; they would not have parted from Him until some words of sympathy and approbation, something very consolatory and satisfying to themselves, had fallen from Him. To have been utterly silent about themselves, to have fallen before Him without uttering a word, without asking for a word, delighted if only they could hold Him by the feet and worship Him—this would not have been, to say the least, natural to a great many modern Christians.

And this suggests one of the broad differences between ancient and much of modern Christianity, in which, if the truth is to be told, the latter does not gain by the comparison. This difference is described by those who find a satisfaction in it by saying that the temper of ancient Christianity is objective, and that of modern Christianity is subjective. If these imposing words are to be translated into plain English, they really mean that ancient Christianity thought less of self than modern Christianity does think; that ancient Christianity was chiefly occupied with the object

of faith—with God, with the majesty, the beauty of God, with His power, wisdom, goodness, His infinite, awful, magnificent life; while modern Christianity is chiefly occupied with the believing mind or subject — that is, with man — with man's changeful thoughts and feelings about God, as though God, with whom there is no variableness, neither a shadow of turning, changed concurrently with man's ever-changing moods about Him. There is a forgetfulness of self about ancient Christianity which is wanting in the Christianity of to-day; there is a noble, simple joy in God's being what He is which is greatly lacking among us. What are the aspects of Christianity which are dealt with most nowadays? Are they not almost exclusively the sides of it which touch human life, which secure the peace and satisfaction of the soul, or the well-being and comfort of society? Modern theology says a great deal more about our justification and assurance, a great deal less about the eternal and uncreated glory of the Divine Redeemer than was the case in the ancient Church of Christ; a great deal more about the social power of Christianity and a great deal less about what is due to the honour of the enthroned and spotless Lamb; and thus many subjects which interested ancient Christians deeply as concerning what is revealed respecting the inner being of God, and the relations between each other of the Three Persons in the Godhead, are often referred to by modern Christians in a pitying sort of way as merely speculative, the fact being that the centre of interest is shifted.

In those old days God was the centre of Christian thought, and now, I fear, we must say that man is too often the centre. In those old days the Christian soul conceived itself as the humble planet moving round the central Sun of Righteousness; in these days the Christian soul claims to be itself the centre of the system, while the true Sun of Righteousness is bidden move round it, and His beauty, His brightness, are estimated chiefly, if not solely, by the lights and shadows which He throws upon it. Contrast, from this point of view, an ancient and a modern hymn. As a rule, the ancient hymn is occupied with our Saviour, with His person, His attributes, His work, His glory; as a rule, the modern hymn is devoted to the glory or, at least, to the feelings, of the believer, and our Lord comes into it just so far as His work, or His promises, or His warnings bear upon those feelings, and not otherwise—not for His own sake, not because He is what He is. Contrast, again, the ancient and the modern idea of Christian worship. The modern idea of worship is simply or chiefly something out of which Christians can get consolation, moral stimulant, improvement, something anyhow for themselves; the ancient idea was that worship is an opportunity of rendering some little portion of that mighty debt of homage to God which is everlastingly His due, of giving thanks to Him as we sing in the Communion Service, giving thanks to Him for His great glory because He is what He is, and because it is a privilege for His creatures to know Him and to praise Him, apart from the benefits they derive from doing so. The less we think of ourselves, except as sinners whose need is pardon, whose business is repentance, the better for us. We know, brethren, what selfishness and unselfishness are in private life; and if the man who, in his intercourse with others, thinks chiefly of what will benefit and gratify them, is a nobler man than the man who thinks chiefly how intercourse with them can be made to gratify himself, then most assuredly the old type of Christianity, which thought first and chiefly of God's glory and God's truth, is an intrinsically nobler and finer thing than the modern Christianity, which is mainly concerned with the comfort and satisfaction of the individual believer; and of the disinterested and generous spirit of the old religion of Christ, the holy women were an early and a beautiful sample, when, early on the morning of Easter day, our Lord met them, and they, instead of saying or thinking anything about themselves, "came and held Him by the feet," and in silence "worshipped Him."

Another feature in the bearing of the women which it is important to notice, is their reverence. "They held Him by the feet and worshipped Him." The traitor had presumed to kiss His blessed face while saying: "Hail, Master!" and those who were spiritually furthest from Him had during His sufferings taken the grossest liberties with His sacred form; but when St. John saw Him in the vision of Patmos he fell at His feet as dead. True, He was now still on earth, but He had not yet been crucified when Simon Peter fell down at His feet, and said: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." And these pious women knew enough about Him to know what was really His due when "they came and held Him by the feet and worshipped Him."

"Yes," some one says; "but then they were Orientals." Well, but what of that? Do you suppose that all Orientals are so very unlike other people, that they lavish their devotion without thought or purpose on the first person who comes in their way? We English often think chiefly of Orientals, in consequence of what we read in books about the practices of Eastern Courts. Eastern Governments have generally been despotisms, and Eastern monarchs have been for ages, as a rule, approached as beings who have a power of disposing absolutely of the lives and liberties of their subjects. The ceremonial which surrounds a monarch of this kind expresses fitly enough the jealousy, suspicion, pride, on the one side, the terrified and obsequious servility, on the other. But go beyond the precincts of an Eastern Court, and you will find that Orientals are much like other people. Nay, there are Oriental races which, in point of fierce personal independence, rival, if

they do not surpass anything of the kind that is to be found in the Western world. The holy women did not take hold of the feet of Jesus and worship Him because they were Orientals, with a strange, passionate taste for the ceremonial expression of feeling, but because they were human, and their souls were moved to the very depths by meeting their risen, their adorable Lord.

What is reverence? Is it an outward posture or a turn of a phrase? Is it the bent head, the bent knee—the subdued voice, the rapt expression of countenance? Is it something which is learned like a lesson, like an art — something that can be put on and off like a dress, something that belongs to the outward, and has no real relations with the inward, man? Most assuredly not. Reverence is a movement of the soul touched by the sense of a greatness that awes it, and of the near presence of which it is, at the time especially, overwhelmingly sensible. Reverence is provoked by greatness of all kinds, although in very different degrees; it is paid to lawful authority, to age, to great gifts of mind, above all, to elevation of character; it is felt constantly where no occasion or opportunity for its outward manifestation presents itself; it may be felt in its very deepest form, because they are close to the highest object of all reverence, by the sick and dying, who cannot move a muscle, who cannot breathe a syllable to give it fitting utterance; but when it is real, and when it can do so, reverence will often appropriate outward expression, and when outward expression is easy, depend upon it the absence of such expression of reverence means the absence of inward reverence. Burke has shown how particular attitudes of the human body correspond to or are inconsistent with deep emotions of the human soul. You cannot, for instance, sit lolling back in an armchair, with your mouth wide open, and feel a warm glow of inward joy; and if you or I were introduced suddenly into the presence of the Queen, we should not keep our hats on, and sit down with our hands in our pockets, on the ground that the genuine sentiment of loyalty is quite independent of its outward expression; and if people come to church, and sit and talk and look about them while prayers are being addressed to the Infinite, the Eternal Being, it is not really because they are so very spiritual as to be able to do without any outward forms; they really do not kneel because they do not with the eye of their souls see Him, the sight of whom awes first the soul and then the body into the profoundest reverence. After all, there is nothing very spiritual, as some people seem to think, in the practice of outward irreverence. Church rules on the subject are but the natural outcome of a deep instinct of the soul of man when it is confronted by the greatness of its Maker and its Redeemer; and so the act of these holy women was not a piece of tawdry Eastern ceremony, but a natural human token of the reverence which at that moment controlled all else in their souls, when they saw their loved Friend and Lord risen from His tomb, the conqueror of death as well as the conqueror of sin, radiant with the beauty of a world which, if it inter-penetrates, is distinct from the world of sense, and so "they held Him by the feet and worshipped Him."

And the third characteristic of the action of the holy women is their tenacity of purpose. They held Jesus by the feet. They may have supposed, like the disciples at first, that they had seen a phantom of some spirit; at any rate, they were not sure what the new condition of His bodily appearance among them might possibly be, so "they held Him by the feet." They took hold of His feet, which they could reach easily, while they fell prostrate before Him, and while they worshipped Him. Now it is instructive to compare this with the account of our Lord's interview with Mary Magdalene, perhaps not many minutes before, in the garden of the Sepulchre. Mary had at first supposed Him to be the gardener, and when she recognised Him by His voice, she, too, made some effort to lay hold on Him, whether by His hands or by His feet we are not told. She was at once checked: "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." A day would come when she might touch Him most really, though spiritually, and until that day came she must wait. There were reasons which made it better for her not to touch His body now while it had not yet ascended to the heavens; reasons, we must suppose, at least in part, peculiar to herself, for on other occasions our risen Lord invited His disciples to assure themselves by the sense of touch of the reality of His resurrection. "Handle Me, and see," He said to them, collectively; "for a spirit hath not flesh and bone as ye see Me have." "Reach hither thy finger," He said to the doubting Thomas, in the Second Lesson for this afternoon, "and behold My hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side, and be not faithless, but believing." But Mary Magdalene needed not this kind of assurance; her spiritual life was fresher—worthier for not being admitted to a particular indulgence of the impulse of affection. God deals with no two souls in exactly the same way, and the supports of the Divine life in one soul may be even perilous to it in another. God knows what is best for each one of us, and in thinking of each other as regards this matter, we ought to try to cultivate a generous charity. He who said to the Magdalen, "Touch Me not," presently met her companions and suffered them not merely to touch Him but to hold Him by the feet. "They held Him by the feet." They could not do more. Prostrate they were, but they knew that to hold His feet was to hold Himself, that while they held His feet He was there, and so they held on, not looking up at Him—silent, prostrate, adoring.

Here, again, they are an example to many of us Christians of to-day, both in the matter of Christian

thought and in the practice of Christian devotion. All that many who own, or perhaps I should say who desire to own, the Christian name can do amid the perplexities of our day and generation is to cling sometimes to the feet of Jesus; in other words, they see how and where the religion which He brought from heaven touches the soul of earth; they see its points of contact with human history, the blessings it can confer on human society, its power of making men and women live worthy, and useful, and contented lives, but they cannot get beyond or above this; they cannot reach the hands of Jesus, and follow His directing government of His Church, and His action in the affairs of the world. Still less can they gaze in spirit on His adorable countenance, and enter into the outskirts of that great world of thought which is the very soul of His religion. Its creeds are to them in many ways not a comfort and a stay, but a perplexity, and it is surrounded by questions which cause them constant disquietude. They can but hold Jesus by the feet. And to such there is but one piece of advice to be given. Hold Him fast; make the most of what truth you know, even though it be the lowest section of truth, even though it be only the feet of Jesus, for truth is one. Every portion of truth is part of an organic whole; every portion of truth joins on to some other portion, and, if held long enough, persistently enough, will lead you to embrace that portion which joins it to it. You may only hold the feet of Jesus, but still they are His feet whose head is the seat of eternal wisdom, whose hands are raised to rule and to bless the world.

Not three days since a correspondent wrote to me: "The only thing that now attaches me at all to Christianity is that it alone, of the systems of thought with which I come into contact, seems to give a working answer to two questions, Whence am I? and whither am I going? All else is dark; all else at least uncertain." Well, but how precious and how pregnant is this one conviction! Let it but sink into the soul, let it take possession of the thought and will, and it will surely lead the way to other truths. Only believe that you come from the hand of the Almighty, the all-wise, the all-good Creator, who has made you in such wise that you may offer Him a true service and may live here for His glory, and may live with Him hereafter in His eternal kingdom—only believe this, and the work of our Lord Jesus Christ as the Prophet who teaches us, as the Priest whose self-oblation atones for your sins, as the King whose laws it is your duty and your happiness to obey, falls naturally into its place in your thought; or, as I find another writer saying: "The one thing in Christianity on which I can dwell with any real satisfaction is the beauty of Christ's human character." Very well, by all means make the most of His human character; but then see what it involves. *Ecce homo.* Certainly He is the pattern man, but on one condition only is He perfect man—namely, that He is also more than man. He says too much about Himself to be a good man if He is only a man. His character can only be reverenced in the long run by those who will open their minds to the truth of His higher nature, to the truth of His godhead. If He could say with perfect truth: "I am meek and lowly of heart," "I am among you as one that serveth," He could also say: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; I and the Father are one thing." As we hold the lower truth perseveringly, intelligently, tenaciously, it lifts as the prize of our continuing to hold it all, to the higher truth with which it is indissolubly linked, and when we have reached this higher truth, the godhead of our Lord and Saviour, all the rest becomes plain to us, like the Promised Land which Moses saw from Pisgah—the value of Christ's atoning death, the wonderful grace of His sacraments, the promised perpetuity of His kingdom among men.

And so, too, in matters of devotion To many, when they begin to lead the Christian life, the only possible prayers are very, very fragmentary ones—the Lord's Prayer, or a bit of it, a few verses of the Psalms, a few hopes, entreaties, resolves put into natural language. In one case no more prayer was possible than this: "O God, if Thou art indeed what they tell me, save me, a poor sinner!" Well, this is very different, no doubt, from the practice of private prayer which is habitual to a Christian who has served God for years; very different from the stately liturgies of the Christian Church. It is not only holding Jesus by the feet, but it has in it the promise of something more. As a lower truth leads on to higher truth, so feeble efforts of prayer lead on to stronger and worthier efforts: the soul acquires an appetite for spiritual effort, and the supply follows the demand. Indeed, in this matter, nothing is more important than sheer tenacity of purpose, for the soul has its periods of depression and ill-health just as much as the body, and there are times when it is as hard for the soul to stir as there are times when it is hard for the body to take exercise. There are times when those faculties of the soul which are the motive forces of prayer seem unable to do their work, when thought cannot fix itself on its Divine object, when the affections cannot expand under the eye of the Sun of Righteousness, when the will seems to be hopelessly flabby or perverse, incapable of any serious purpose or spiritual effort; and at such times the Tempter whispers, "What is the good of trying to go on praying when prayer has no longer the soul of prayer in it, when it has become a mere husk, an empty form?" Be sure that to yield to this suggestion is a great mistake. In these times of spiritual dryness and discouragement, adherence to habits of prayer is more than ever necessary. The habit carries the soul safely from one period of spiritual warmth and

life on to another. The mere scaffolding is worth a great deal, and ought not lightly to be sacrificed because, for the moment, it is only a scaffolding. If nothing more can be done in the hours of spiritual darkness and perplexity it is possible to hold Jesus by the feet; presently He will speak words of assurance and encouragement, and, lo! the night of the soul shall be turned into day.

Here, then, are three elements of true service of God always and everywhere. The true servant forgets self; he bows in his inmost spirit before God's awful greatness; he makes the most of what little truth he knows, of such practices of devotion as are within his reach. Millions of Christians have found in such a law of service the stay, the strength, and, in the end, the perfection of their lives, and it will be well for us, too, dear brethren, to take our places, in spirit, this Easter beside the holy women, trusting to the indulgent mercy of our Lord for an acceptance which we cannot, indeed, command in virtue of any excellence of our own, but which we may be sure will not be refused to any who love and serve Him in humble sincerity.

THE House of Laymen will meet on the 12th, 13th, and 14th February at the Church House, Dean's-yard, being the same days as the Convocation of Canterbury. Mr. Holland, of the National Society's office, has resigned the secretaryship, and Mr. J. Larcombe has been appointed provisionally. We learn from the *London Diocesan Magazine* that the members of the House of Laymen have furnished at their own expense the large room at the Church House.

THE Bishop of Lichfield has conferred the office and title of Lector on thirty-six laymen. The *Lichfield Diocesan Magazine* says:—"The office is one of great antiquity, and was held in high esteem in the Christian Church, but it has long fallen into abeyance. In these days, however, when so many lay members of the Church are giving assistance to the clergy in reading the lessons in divine service, there is very sufficient reason for reviving this office, and for assigning a definite place among Church workers to those who discharge this very solemn and important duty." It is also stated that the Bishop will be glad to receive the names of any others duly qualified who may desire a similar recognition.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1890.

THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

THE new year opens with an excellent promise of commercial prosperity for the United Kingdom. The upward tendency which characterised the beginning of the old year was not only amply maintained, but has actually increased, and to-day we find the great railways of the country almost unable to grapple with the increased demands upon their traffic arrangements. The rising tide of trade has caught them unawares, and a mass of goods to which the existing accomodation is unequal blocks the lines. It is the same story in all our great midland cities. Masters are giving men plenty of employment, mercantile companies are laying down fresh machinery, extending their premises, increasing production in order to meet the rising demands of British customers all over the world. Expansion of trade has been one of the remarkable features of the year 1889. Men in business are now sure of the revival of commerce, and we venture to predict that the year 1890 will show an enormous development of the swelling volume of trade which is everywhere heralded by public statistics and private sources of information.

All this is quite the best news that a new year can bring us. Let us not forget to emphasise the fact that good trade invariably follows a period of political calm. The government of which Lord Salisbury is the head, and of which Lord Hartington is the whole-hearted ally, has now been in office for some three and a-half years. Profound peace abroad has marked the whole of this period. The British flag has flown unsullied in every quarter of the globe, and, as we know, trade always follows that flag. At home there has

been but one trouble, and that is the ancient one of Ireland. Thanks mainly to Mr. Balfour, law once more reigns almost supreme. The only signs of disorder which exist are sporadic, and the National League is fast dwindling down into the dimensions of an effete organisation. One reason of this is the wonderful benefits which have accrued to Ireland from the revival of trade in England. At no date has the cross-channel traffic between the two islands been so heavy. The energies which have been wasting so long in the pursuit of political chimæras are, it would seem, finding a better outlet in the development of Irish industries. No better or more encouraging signs could be noted. Irishmen, with their quickness, energy and versatility, ought to be able, more than any other people, to see their way to diverting into their own channels a vast amount of that trade which is now being enjoyed in London by Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians, Italians, Scandinavians and Russians. If only one tithe of the ability which the Parnellite Members of Parliament display in political warfare were expended in plotting how to undermine the commercial exploits in British markets of foreign traders we should hear very little more of Irish discontent. Indeed, as it is, the Irish cattle trade with Great Britain is a marvellous instance of the way in which propinquity to good markets can be made the source of national wealth. Ireland supplies the English markets every year with upwards of 40,000 tons more fresh meat than all foreign countries and British colonies put together. The Irish Agricultural Returns show that in 1888 the cattle, sheep, and swine exported from Ireland to Great Britain numbered 1,921,272, their estimated value being £11,770,492. We feel convinced that if the Irish farmer was enabled finally to cast off the sway of the professional agitator and attend to the cleanliness of his butter, lard, etc., he could cut the foreigner out of many other great and growing British markets. Mr. Balfour's great achievement is that he has given Ireland rest for a brief space (all too brief for her needs), and the results are abundantly seen in the wonderful expansion of Irish trade and the improved financial state of the country. The value of land has risen; the savings of the people have increased; new industries are being introduced, and capital is beginning to cast an eye upon a country which, if properly developed, would be a teeming mother of industrial children.

But if the expansion of trade has been the first and most important feature of last year, from an Imperial point of view, the next remarkable feature of interest has been the change in the attitude and feeling of political parties. Three years ago, about this time, the Gladstonian party were in ecstasies of delight over the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill. Their cry was the Unionist party was going to pieces, and if left to itself must crumble away in the course of the session. Another year passed and again the same prophesies were indulged in. But the political seers prophesied falsely. Their young men dreamed dreams: their old men saw visions. Instead of separating the Unionist leaders drew closer together, until in 1888 the Parnellite party in England and Ireland were forced to recognise that in numbers, in discipline, and in public esteem the allied Unionist army was a growing instead of declining quantity in the political world. During the past year the efforts of the Separatist party have been directed to the task of discrediting the English party which follows Lord Hartington. With bell, book, and candle Mr. Gladstone has been called upon to excommunicate from the Liberal fold the independent men who preserve their Liberalism, while supporting Lord Salisbury's Government. These efforts, together with the increased familiarity with each other which political association invariably brings, has had the effect of gradually making more homogeneous the Unionist party. By the time the next general election comes, we venture to think that the foundation will be laid of a great National party, not by the baptism of a few leaders, but by the inexorable logic of facts.

While the action of the Gladstonian party has resulted only in the better consolidation of the Unionist party, it has not by any means bettered their own position. The year 1889 will long be remembered as the date of a further split in the ranks of what was once called the Great Liberal party. Deprived in 1886 of one wing of its supporters, Mr. Gladstone's party is now a mere collection of political groups. Chief among them is Mr. Labouchere's own particular party of extreme Radicals, numbering some sixty or seventy. These are the men who hate the Church, because it stands as a barrier against their Secularising tendencies; who vote against Royal grants, because they are eager to discredit the monarchy; who desire the abolition of the House of Lords' because they hate the hereditary principle; and who advocate Home Rule as a short cut to carrying out their own private and political views. Then we have outside the House of Commons the Socialistic Labour Party, who are using the Trades Unions as a stalking horse for propagating their principles of confiscation. They hope to sell the votes of working men to Mr. Gladstone, exactly as Mr. Parnell has sold the Parliamentary votes of his party, but we are much mistaken if they have as many votes to sell as they would try and make us believe. Still the Socialists have one of the first qualificatlons for political success—namely, the art of making much noise out of small materials, and no one is more easily affected by this art than Mr. Gladstone himself.

In a word, the Gladstonians at the commencement of a new year are hopelessly disorganised and divided. The Welsh contingent is at war with itself. Half the Radical M.P.'s in the Principality

are for going in for a Land League movement and a Welsh Parliament at once, while the other half are for moderate tactics. Mr. Gladstone himself, though invariably described as "in splendid health," is just turned eighty, and has greatly lost the magnetic force on the platform which made him so powerful a factor at mass meetings. His western trip in the autumn was a distinct failure, while his speeches at Manchester had none of the old ring about them. Say what they will, the Old Man Eloquent is a fading and not an increasing influence in British politics, and he could no more run the country in any great organic constitutional change, than he can take off years from his life. Mr. Gladstone and his party are out in the cold. They thought they could dictate a policy and a programme to free and independent men, and they have found their mistake.

THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE DIACONATE.

A Paper by the Rev. JOHN J. COLEMAN, M.A., of Dulverton, Somerset.

[The distinctive nature of the Order of Deacons and the functions proper to the same, as shown in Holy Scripture and in early Christian writings, compared with the present theory and practice of the Church of England, in respect of the Diaconate, together with some suggestions for the restoration to this order of its primitive characteristics.]

The question has of old been raised and discussed whether or not this office had its original institution when the Apostles set apart the first Christian martyr and his six companions, with prayer and the laying on of hands, in order to dispense or to superintend the dispensing of the Church's funds among her members. Though St. Chrysostom, followed by the Council in Trullo, answers the question in the negative (S. Chrys., Hom. xiv., Acts vi.), yet the testimony of earlier writers seems to justify what may be taken, probably, as the almost universal opinion of the Church Catholic, viz., that the ordination of the seven men, recorded in the 6th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, was the institution of a New Order of Ministers—the development of the Apostolic Ministry by the bestowal of, chiefly its lower, but, in one or more particulars, some of its higher and more spiritual functions—upon this new Order, whose members then, or soon after, received the name of Deacons. S. Irenæus speaks of Nicolaus as "one of the seven who were first ordained to the Diaconate by the Apostles" (Book I., xxvi. 3), and refers to S. Stephen as having been "chosen by the Apostles first Deacon." (Book III., xii. 10.) S. Cyprian, in writing upon the appointment of the clergy, after referring to the Divine Command given to Moses, as to the appointment of Eleazar in his father's stead, says: "God commands a priest to be appointed before all the congregation" . . . . This is afterwards observed in the Acts of the Apostles . . . . And we find the Apostles not only observed this in the ordination of bishops and priests, but also in that of deacons, concerning which too it is written in their Acts: "*Then the twelve called the whole multitude of the disciples and said unto them.*" (S. Cyprian, Eph. lxvii. 4.) S. Cyril, of Jerusalem, writes: "Nor in the twelve Apostles only wrought this grace of the Holy Ghost, but also in the first-born children of this once barren Church, I mean the Seven Deacons." (St. Cyril, Lect. xvii. 24.) The Council of Neocæsarea, cir. 314, by its 15th canon, seems to express the same opinion upon this question: "The deacons ought to be seven according to rule, even though the city be very great, but of this you will be persuaded by the book of the Acts." This opinion is in agreement with the practice of the Church at Rome, as we have it stated in the middle of the third century in an epistle of Cornelius, who, in giving the number of members in the several orders of the ministry in that Church, states that there were seven deacons. In support of this view of the origin of the Diaconate, we may refer to Bishop Lightfoot's dissertation on The Christian Ministry, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. After stating the account contained in Acts vi. to be that of the creation of the Diaconate, he says: "I have assumed that the office thus established represents the later Diaconate; for, though this point has been much disputed, I do not see how the identity of the two can reasonably be called in question. If the word deacon does not occur in the passage, yet the corresponding verb and substantive, διακονεῖν and διακονία, are repeated more than once."

It may not be out of place to say here a few words upon the derivation and meaning of Διάκονος. In Buttmann's Lexilogus its derivation is maintained (as opposed to the derivation which compounds it of διά and κόνις) to originate in διάκω or διήκω, which latter, with a change of vowel, becomes διώκω in its intransitive sense of *to run*. Διάκονος therefore, as derived from διώκω, is stated to mean properly *the runner*. The word is used in a specific sense in only two passages in the New Testament, to which reference will be made further on; elsewhere in that book it is employed in a general sense, to denote a person who does any kind of service or who performs any ministration. It is used of servants in attendance at a feast (S. Matt. xxii. 13), of persons commissioned to perform functions in a representative capacity (Rom. xiii. 4), of persons charged with the administration of something (Eph. iii. 7), and of a disciple or attendant (S. John xii. 26). These several meanings of the word seem to be peculiarly applicable to the various duties of those officers of the Church who became designated by the term Διάκονοι. Having made this short digression, we will now return to the subject more immediately under our consideration.

Whether it be admitted or not that "the Seven" mentioned in Acts vi. were deacons, this fact remains that we find the order of deacons so recognised in the New Testament, that even if the Diaconate was not indeed instituted by Divine Revelation, it was introduced into the churches which were under the direction of the Apostle Paul, as is proved by the mention of deacons in his Epistle to the Philippians, and by the directions given by him in the first Epistle to S. Timothy.

Being what it is in origin, and by the recognition with which it meets in Holy Scripture, it is not surprising that we find the Diaconate recognised in after ages as of perpetual obligation in the Church Universal, and as being necessary to the due and complete organisation of every particular Church. The epistles of S. Ignatius contain several references to deacons. We may take two as showing how necessary he deemed them to the Church. To the Smyrneans he writes: "See that ye follow the

bishop, even as Jesus Christ does the Father, and the presbytery as ye would the Apostles, and *reverence the deacons as being the institution of God.*" In the Epistle to the Trallians he couples the deacons with the bishops and presbyters, and adds : "Apart from these there is no Church."

When we come to inquire what were the special duties and the ministerial functions to be performed by the deacons in the Primitive Church, we shall not gain much definite information from the New Testament. If we regard S. Stephen and his fellows as deacons, then we gather that the primary object, in the institution of the Order, was to provide superintendents for the distribution of the daily allowance out of the common fund to the proper recipients thereof, in order that the Apostles might be free from the cares and distraction of this particular work, and have their minds and their time at the disposal of the more spiritual claims of the Apostolic office. We find S. Stephen disputing with Jews. Whether this disputation arose from any ministerial act of evangelising, or was not so connected, it is impossible to say ; hence nothing can be gathered from this fact as indicative of a special function belonging to the Diaconate. Later on in the Acts of the Apostles, we find S. Philip, "one of the Seven," proclaiming the Gospel in Samaria and baptising converts, and soon afterwards going by divine revelation to meet the eunuch that he might convert him to the faith, and administer to him the sacrament of initiation ; but these ministerial acts of preaching and baptising may have been performed by S. Philip, not in virtue of his Diaconate, but on the authority of a divine revelation, which constituted him an "Evangelist," as he is called in the 21st chapter of the Acts (Acts viii. 26 ; Apost. Const., Book VII., xlvi). In the Epistle to the Philippians the deacons are simply named, and no information can be gathered as to their special duties. In his 1st Epistle to S. Timothy, to which reference has already been made, S. Paul gives directions to guide Timothy in the administration of ordination. The qualifications, personal and domestic, which are to be required of candidates for the Diaconate are very similar to those which are necessary to candidates for the presbyterate, with this one notable difference however—the presbyter must be "apt to teach," but no such gift is stated as requisite to the deacon.

In pursuing our inquiry as to the specific duties of the deacon of the Primitive Church we gain some considerable information from various authorities of the first five centuries. From S. Ignatius we gather nothing definite, beyond his speaking of them as ministers of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, and his stating that they are not ministers of meats and of drinks, but of the Church of God (Trall. 2), and further, his joining them with the bishop and the presbyters, as being worthy of the reverence and as claiming the submission of the people. The duties of the Diaconate may be divided into two classes : (i.), those which were incidental to the secular requirements of the Church ; and (ii.), those which belonged to her government, to her worship, and to her spiritual ministrations.

(i.) The former class of duties attaching to the office of a deacon consisted chiefly in the administration of the Church's funds under the presidency of the bishop. The discharge of this duty would seem to have been the *raison d'être* of the office, assuming that it was the Diaconate to which the "Seven" of Acts vi. were ordained. Bingham specifies that, amongst others, it was one of the duties of deacons to be the bishop's "sub-almoners, to take care of the necessitous, such as orphans, widows, virgins, martyrs in prison, and all the poor and sick who had any title to be maintained out of the public revenues of the Church. The deacons were particularly to inquire into the necessities and wants of all these, and make relation thereof to the bishop, and then distribute to them such charities as they received from him towards their relief and assistance." In support of this statement he refers to S. Cyprian, who mentions one Nicostratus as "having lost the sacred administration of the Diaconate for having, by sacrilegious fraud, subtracted the Church's revenues, and withheld the deposits of widows and orphans" (S. Cyprian, Eph. lii. 1). He also refers to the Apostolical Constitutions, where he says "the duty of the deacon is thus described, that he should inform the bishop when he knows any one to be in distress, and then distribute to their necessities by the directions of the bishop." (Bing. ii., cxx., 16). It was probably this portion of their office which gave to deacons that power and influence which, in course of time, tempted them to overstep their proper functions, and to assume, in some instances, ministrations belonging to the presbyterate, and also to affect a superiority over presbyters. (Robertson Hist. Chr. Ch., iii., 203). The second of the two classes into which we have ventured to divide the duties of the Diaconate consisted of those duties which belonged to (1) the government of the Church, (2) the arrangements for the carrying on of the worship of the Church, and (3) the spiritual ministrations of the Church.

(ii). 1. The authority for the government of the Church, and for the administration of correction to offenders against her disciplinary system, resided in the bishop ; but the deacons possessed a delegated authority, whereby they were entrusted with the duty of assisting in the excommunication of offenders and of reconciling the penitent (Apost. Const., Bk. II., xvi.). Deacons also were associated with the bishop and presbyters in adjudicating upon offences (Id. xlvi.). The laity were to make known their desires to the bishop, through the deacons, whose direction was to be followed (Id. xxviii.). They also were employed on embassies from one Church to another (Ignat. ad Philad. 10). In a case of emergency, even the episcopal function of reconciling a penitent to the Church was to be delegated to a deacon, as we learn from 18th of S. Cyprian's Epistles.

From the example of Alexander, Archbishop of Alexandria, in the action he took against Arius, it would seem that deacons were associated with presbyters in giving counsel and consent to the bishop in the proceedings for the condemnation of heresy (Bing., Book II., xix. 8). The like evidence is afforded by the proceedings of Siricius, Bishop of Rome, against Jovinian (Id. s. 11). It was also the duty of the deacon, after making the needful inquiries, to judge of the recommendatory letters brought by strangers, who came from other churches (Apos. Const., Book II., lviii.).

2. A considerable part of the duties of deacons lay in connection with the making and carrying out of the arrangements necessary for the orderly and decent conduct of the worship of the Church. They were required to dispose of the places in the assembly, and to superintend the congregation for the purpose of maintaining seemly behaviour and attention. (Apost.

Const., Book II., lvii.; S. Chrysos., Hom. xxiv., Acts). During the progress of the service notices were given by a deacon to inform the different classes, of which the congregation was composed, as to the offering of particular prayers, and as to the departure of the unbelievers, the unbaptised, and the penitents (Apos. Const., Book VIII., passim). And when the communion of the people was ended, it was the duty of the deacon to carry what remained of the consecrated elements into the vestry before the completion of the service (Id. xiii.).

The care of the Holy Table and of its ornaments and utensils, and other services which were subsequently performed by members of the inferior orders, originally devolved upon the deacons (Bing., Book II., cxx., s. 4-15).

3. It remains for us to gather such testimony as is afforded us as to the more strictly spiritual functions which were performed by deacons. The highest function belonging to the office of deacons would seem to be the administration of the Cup at the Eucharist. This, rather than the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, may perhaps be fitly called "the crown of their office;" because the latter function does not of right attach to the office of the deacon, but is only permissible to him by special delegation of the bishop. We have very early evidence of the administration of the Cup, and indeed of both elements, by deacons. Justin Martyr speaks of deacons administering them, both in the assembly, and to those who were absent (Apol. i., 65-67). The 18th Canon of the 1st Nicene Council regulates their ministrations in this particular. The 2nd Canon of the Council of Ancyra affords proof that the distribution of the sacred elements was the duty of the deacon. The Apostolical Constitutions bear similar witness (Book VIII., 13-28). Other spiritual functions were committed to deacons: to bid prayers, to offer prayer even at the celebration of the Eucharist, to give exhortations to the people, according to the prescribed forms at different parts of the service, to bring the gifts to the altar, to bring the oblations of the people to the priest, and to read the Gospel and also Homilies (Apos. Const. passim, Book VIII., 12; Bing., Book II., cxx. 56; Apost. Const., Book II., lvii.).

It would seem that the right to administer baptism is not inherent in the office of the Diaconate, but that a deacon baptizes by virtue of a special delegation of authority from the bishop, which, presumably, might be given to individual deacons, either with a limitation to a particular case, or with permission to act upon it generally, whenever occasion should demand, by reason of the impossibility of procuring the services of a presbyter (Apos. Const., Book III., 10-20; Book VIII., 28-46. Tertull. de Baptismo, 17. Cyril of Jerusalem, Lect. xvii. 35; Bing., Book II., cxx. 9).

What has been said about the administration of baptism by deacons would, to some extent, apply to their exercise of the office of preaching, The writer of the Commentaries on the Epistles of S. Paul, published among the works of S. Ambrose, and generally attributed to Hilary of Sardinia, who lived in the 4th century, states that in his time deacons did not preach, "though he thinks originally all deacons were evangelists." In the 6th century, Cæsarius of Arles gives permission to presbyters and to deacons in his diocese to read homilies; and Vigilius calls two deacons to account, complaining of their execrable pride in having presumed to preach without the order of their bishop; but we are informed that Leontius of Antioch, the Arian, ordained Aëius deacon, and permitted him to teach ecclesiastical doctrines (Bing., Book II., xx. 11; Smith's Dict. Chris. Antiq. "Deacon"). Ephrem Syrus has been adduced as an instance of a preaching deacon by reason of his authorship of many homilies, but the accuracy of the statement that he was a deacon is controverted by the translator of Ephrem's Rythms, in Oxf. Lib. of the Fathers, in his preface to that volume. Hickes, the non-juror, in his treatise on the Christian Priesthood (p. 37), quotes Habertus as showing "that anciently deacons never were permitted to preach *ê cathedra* in a solemn and sacerdotal manner, that is, as messengers or ambassadors of Christ by whom God did instruct them and exhort them to repent, and who in Christ's stead, our great High Priest in heaven, prayed them to be reconciled to God."

From the testimony that has come down it is impossible, perhaps, to fix the origin of the "archdeacon" earlier than the 4th century, when it is found among the writings of Optatus and S. Jerome, though it is usually given to Lawrence, the deacon, who suffered martyrdom in the same persecution with his bishop, Xystus, of Rome, in the year A.D. 260, and to Cæcilian, the deacon, who became bishop at Carthage early in the 4th century. However, it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that, even though the title of archdeacon may not have come into use earlier than the period stated above, one of the deacons of every church had given to him, by reason of seniority or of superior holiness or ability, a certain authority and pre-eminence over the other members of his order, and in the execution of the various duties belonging to the Diaconate. Moreover, there is no reason to suppose that, when the distinctive title of "archdeacon" was first used, it ever denoted the advance of the bearer of it to the order of the presbyterate. The duties of the early archdeacon seem to be identical in kind with those which belonged to the Diaconate. He had a power of censure over the other deacons and over the members of the minor orders, the privilege, over other deacons, of being in close attendance on the bishop, the chief authority under the bishop in dispensing the revenues of the Church, and in ministering at the altar and following him with the Cup whenever the bishop was the celebrant at the Eucharist. But in process of time presbyters were appointed archdeacons. "Archdeacons in the 9th century," says Bingham, "were some of them at least of the Order of Presbyters" (Bing., Book II., 21 passim).

II. Having now endeavoured to form some definite ideas as to the office and functions of the deacons of the Primitive Church, let us compare the result of our investigations with the present theory and practice of the Church of England as regards the Diaconate, with the view of ascertaining how far the original institution is realised or depreciated, whether in our theory or in our practice.

The duties of a deacon are set forth in one of the vows required of the deacon in the Ordination Service as follows:—"To assist the priest in Divine Service, and especially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof, and to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies in the Church, and to instruct the youth in the Catechism, in the absence of the priest, to baptize infants, and to preach, if he be admitted thereto by the bishop. And furthermore, it is his office, where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people

of the parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell unto the curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the parishoners or others."

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

"PERFECTLY ABSURD."

SIR,—I have no objection to offer to the heading which your correspondents have thought well to adopt. I think I shall not have much trouble in making good my position.

I have no intention to follow "Presbyter" through all the irrelevant matter which he has written. I will come to the point at once.

"J. B.'s" position is this: "God purposes to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, holy, and happy immortality through processes of a momentous nature, which take place during aions or ages."

"Presbyter" objects to my inferences from this. These are:—(1.) All men die unhappy; (2) All men die with a wish to be made happy; (3.) The purpose is not revealed; (4.) It frustrates the object of the Atonement.

I think it necessary, even at the expense of a little repetition, to set these matters forth quite clearly. It is important that we should not be dealing with things intangible.

"Presbyter" says these inferences are not there even by implication. It only implies that "many die unprepared for a safe, holy, and happy immortality." Now let us see.

A principle, as I take it, is of universal application. Man is mortal. All men die. This goes without the saying.

Now this "process" is either applicable to all, or it is applicable to none. If it be applicable to all, then all die unhappy. But many die happy. *Ergo.*

So with respect to (2). If the principle be applicable there is again no exception. All must wish for happiness. God makes no man happy against his will. But many die with seared consciences. They have absolutely no apprehension. *Ergo.*

(3.) If the purpose be revealed, it will be very easy to indicate the passage. Where is it? So point (3) is established.

I wonder that point (4.) should not be admitted. It was my notion, but perhaps I am wrong, that Universalists were all agreed that the Atonement was only a pretty theory. This must be so if there is to be any consistency in their views. Either salvation is by the Atonement or it is by this process. If it be by this process it cannot be by the Atonement. There cannot be two means of salvation. Which is the absurd one?

"Presbyter" must pardon me when I say that the Atonement is no "*bare fact.*" It was never intended to be. It is not only *a* source of happiness, but *the* only one. It cannot by any manner of means stand alone.

But does "J. B." seriously mean that "reconciling all things unto Himself" implies Universalism? Then what about sin and Satan? I do not ask, because of its profanity, the real question. And what is implied by "treading his enemies under his feet"?

Intelligent people holding opinions does not justify those opinions. Many intelligent (?) people believe there is no God.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage,
Jan. 4th, 1890.

ST. JOHN VI.

SIR,—Your correspondent "*Inquirens*" asks me two questions, one of them ungrammatical and the other unmeaning; and he concludes his letter with an assertion pretty positively expressed. When our Lord says one thing, and your correspondent says the contrary, I cannot but choose to ascribe authority to Him who spake as never man spake. Referring to the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel, particularly verses 35, 37, 48-51, and 53-58, I do not see how it is possible to show from the whole chapter that two *Breads* are spoken of. A Quaker may think that it is; not one (so as I can understand) who regards this chapter in connection with the Feast of the Holy Communion.

I did not say that "*Inquirens's*" explanation, which explains nothing, favours Transubstantiation. I said that your correspondent appeared to think he had suggested a new argument for that doctrine, viz., that Faber's view of St. John, 6th chapter, supports it.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

6th January, 1890.

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of 28th ult. there is a letter from Canon Crosthwaite purporting to give the reason why the Irish Church Prayer Book does not contain the "Ornaments Rubric." The writer tells that an old Prayer Book was produced at the Irish Synod, with the leaf on which that Rubric was printed torn out; and that the Synod concluded from this that that Rubric never had authority in Ireland, and therefore excluded it from the Prayer Book as revised. It is true that some one very absurdly tried to make a point from this old defective book. But it is not true that the Synod of the Church expunged the Rubric on these grounds. It resolved on what it did for the obvious reason that the "Ornaments Rubric" is impossible to tell the proper application of, and has been the source of strife and mischief.

When your correspondent has a silly story of this kind to tell, it might be worth his while to tell it so as not to make it downright nonsensical. He says this defective Prayer Book came over with either Elizabeth or Charles II., if either of those monarchs was ever in Ireland. Perhaps the writer was thinking of Cromwell, who was, although we do not hear that he brought any Prayer Books with him. Then Mr. Crosthwaite tells of a Charles II. book that he has, he supposes exactly like the defective one. Why does he suppose so? If the defective book was of the time of Elizabeth, the Charles II. book is not exactly the same, as any one with any knowledge of Church history should remember. And so your correspondent goes on to argue from the catchword, at the foot of a page of a book that he has seen, to prove that something was in a book that he never saw, and cannot tell the date of within a century.

Not contented with all this absurdity, the writer revives a thing not in the least to the purpose, viz., the exploded accusation against the writers of the Preface to the Irish Prayer Book, that they introduce a falsehood into it, about the new question and answer foisted into the Catechism. There is no falsehood, but there is strict and literal truth, and nothing else, in the Preface; and there is nothing foisted into the Catechism. To foist means to insert by forgery. It is not in the Irish Prayer Book that falsehood and foisting are to be found, and it would be advisable that its critics should avoid such practices. B.

1st January, 1890.

SIR,—A contest is going on as to the force of this Rubric. The *Church Times*, etc., party make it obligatory to be obeyed by all. The Dean of Peterborough makes it merely permissive. The *Record*, etc., party make it neither one nor the other, but a dead letter. The Bishop of Peterborough would have a schedule attached, defining all ornaments and vestures enforced or permitted. But now a new light is thrown on the matter. The *Church Times* lately took pains to show that Edward's first book came out only seven days before the end of his second year, so that it was legal for only seven days of that year; that it is doubtful whether within the seven days it had the King's sanction; that the clergy could not have had it in their hands till his third year; and that the use was not imposed till Whitsuntide of that year. All this seems to have led to inquiries from one "H. J. R." As his letter is not before me, I can only give the editor's reply. It is to this startling effect, that "all the ornaments remain legal which were in use in the mediæval Church of England, except such as were specifically abolished by such proclamations earlier than the second year of Edward VI." Now we know what the Ornaments Rubric is held to mean! All exactly as Henry VIII. left it. We are for ornaments and vestures to go back to Roman use, except so far as repealed by proclamation earlier than 2nd of Edward VI., that is, *not at all!* All since Henry VIII. is null and void. We are to stand exactly as he left us!

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—I have just found the reason why *The Church Times* is out of conceit with Edward's first Book, and tells us that Henry VIII. is to be our model. Edward's first Book expressly forbids *elevation*. (See Griffith & Co.'s, new edition, p. 203.) When this book was made a model the above fact was overlooked. Now it is discovered, and the chain is gone.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE *Manchester Guardian* says that it is officially announced that in future no "Literates" will be admitted to the Bishop of Manchester's examination of candidates for holy orders. Notice is now given that a Divinity school, to be called "Schola Episcopi," has been established at the cathedral, with the sanction of the Bishop, for the education of candidates for orders. "The Dean and Archdeacon Anson, Canons Crane, Woodhouse, Davenport Kelly, and Julius Lloyd have undertaken to be tutors in this school. Only those who are recommended by the Bishop of Manchester for ordination in his diocese will be admitted. Students will have to attend classes in the school for two years, and may maintain themselves during that period by obtaining the position of paid lay-readers in the diocese. Students who obtain a certificate of approval in this school, and have passed the Oxford and Cambridge preliminary examinations, will be admitted to the examination for deacon's orders. Canon Davenport Kelly has undertaken to supply any further information on the subject."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Andrews, Rev. George Hubert, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces (fourth class).
Bailey, Rev. J. H. E., Chaplain to the Forces at Portsmouth.
Blakeney, Ven. John Edward, D.D., Archdeacon of Sheffield, Prebend of York, and Honorary Chaplain to the Queen; Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty.
Buck, Rev. W. A., Merchant Taylors' Missioner in West Hackney.
Cardew, Rev. W., Chaplain to Earl Manvers.
Chadwick, Rev. Howard, M.A., Curate of Headingley, Leeds; Vicar of Christ Church, Glodwick, Oldham.
Clark-Kennedy, Rev. Archibald Ewart, B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Savernake, Wilts.
Deane, Rev. James, M.A., Curate of St. Maurice, Winchester; Vicar of Kirklington, Oxfordshire.
Dixon, Rev. Frederick Arthur, B.A., Rector of Chilthorne, Somerset; Vicar of Christ Church, Silloth, Cumberland.
Ellis, Rev. J. Crowle, Senior Curate of Penmaenmawr; Chaplain of the Paddington Welsh Mission, London.
Hilton, Rev. Alfred G., M.A., Rector of Stansfield, Suffolk; Rector of Daglingworth, Gloucestershire.
Kennedy, Rev. John, M.A., Head Master of Aldenham School; Head Master of Tonbridge School.
Milne, Rev. Edgar Astley, M.A., Rector of Shenley, Bucks.
Morrice, Rev. J. D., Vicar of Longbridge Deverell, Wilts; Rector of St. Edmund's, Salisbury.
Murray, Rev. Charles Davison, Vicar of Nynehead, Somersetshire.
Nesbit, Rev. J. W., M.A., Rector of Aldborough, Norfolk.
Outram, Rev. G. S., Rector of Redmile; Rector of Ropsley, Grantham.
Penrose, Rev. John, M.A., Curate of Potterne; Vicar of West Ashton, Wilts.
Sells, Rev. William, M.A., late Assistant-Curate of Wokingham; Rector of Niton, Isle of Wight.
Sheppard, Rev. J. E., M.A., Sub-Dean of the Chapels Royal; Honorary Chaplain to the Royal Society of Musicians of Great Britain.
Slater, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Bywell St. Andrew-with-St. James, Riding Mill; Honorary Canon of Newcastle.
White, Rev. Joseph Henry, M.A., Rector of Brattleby, Lincoln.
Wright, Rev. Henry Skynner, Chaplain of the Seckford Hospital, Woodbridge, Suffolk.
Young, Rev. Frederick William, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Rotherfield Greys, Oxon.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Addams, Rev. Francis Holland, first Incumbent of St. Peter's, Notting-hill, at Torghallen, Babbicombe, Devon, on the 3rd inst., aged 62.
Bates, Rev. J. Elphinstone Elliot, formerly Rector of Whalton for many years at Milbourne Hall, Newcastle-on-Tyne, on the 1st inst., aged 79.
Blane, Rev. Henry, Rector of that parish, at Folketon Rectory, Ganton, York, on the 31st ult., aged 78.
Brown, Rev. P. U., late Vicar of Ellingham, at Downlands, near Lymington, on the 1st inst., aged 77.
Chancellor, Rev. Robert Blair Maconochie, Gonville and Caius College, Cambs, Vicar of Otley, Yorkshire, at Eastbourne, on the 3rd inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

INNOCENCY.

By the Very Rev. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday, January 5th, 1890.

"Keep innocency, and take heed unto the thing that is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last."—Psalm xxxvii. 38.

"KEEP innocency." It is on those two words I would fix your thoughts on this afternoon of the first Sunday of the new year. May God bless your meditations to the good of all our souls! Perhaps some of you will ask, "How is it possible for us to 'keep innocency' in such a world as this? How is it possible, for instance, to live in great cities without the knowledge of evil being glaringly protruded, even before the young? How can they even walk in our streets, how can they read the most ordinary newspaper, or take up the most common-place book, without being compelled, whether they will or no, to familiarity with the existence of all kinds of evil?" "The state of innocency," they would say, "has become impossible to us; we live under a fatal necessity for the knowledge of good and evil." My friends, the objection rests on misapprehension. The baleful knowledge of evil is the knowledge of it by participation in it, not the mere inevitable knowledge that evil exists. Innocence is not the same thing as ignorance. It is not ignorance of evil, but its distinct and abhorrent repudiation; it is the glorious answer of the Hebrew youth, when he was assailed daily with the terrible temptation, "How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?"

Others again will say: We cannot be innocent, for none have been innocent; all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. Take the confessions even of the holiest, and see how full they are of shame and contrition. Job was compelled to cry, "If I wash myself in snow water, and make my hand never so clean, yet Thou shalt plunge me in the ditch, and my own clothes shall abhor me." St. Peter, shrinking from contact with the awful purity of Christ, exclaimed, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." St. Paul's bitter wail rings through the ages, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Again, my friends, such reasoning is mistaken. Innocence is not the same thing as perfectness. One and One only who wore human flesh was sinless. All the rest have had weaknesses and imperfections which they have not concealed, of which they have been painfully conscious, but as soon as they have been born of God, even though the weakness of their mortal nature should at any time have failed for an instant, their permanent fellowship with God is not thereby interrupted. The prevailing habit and character of holiness is not broken. Do not misinterpret the confessions of the holiest. The spot which lies on the tender conscience like a spark of fire is unfelt by the conscience of the hardened sinner, which has become utterly coarse and callous, seared as with a hot iron. Luther, Bunyan, Whitefield, among others, have spoken of themselves with utter reprobation, and this infection of nature remaineth even in them that are regenerate, and yet they even in their unregenerate days have not been sold under sin; their lives were whiteness itself compared with the blackness of the willing sinners around them. When the slanderers of that saint of God, George Whitefield, took hold of his own outpourings of sorrow before God to represent that as a youth he had been a monster of depravity, he was driven to declare that the faults which he bewailed had only been such as many men would not have counted to be sins. Job, though guilty before God, unflinchingly maintained his innocence before men. St. Paul uses the language of a penitent, yet St. Paul, when attacked by his enemies, said plainly, "I know nothing against myself." Imperfect we are and must be before the eye of "Him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," "who chargeth even his angels with folly," and before whom "the very heavens are not clean"; yet both in God's sight and to men we may still be all that is meant by innocent, that is, blameless, harmless, "unspotted from the world"; blameless of any and every charge which men can bring against us. Harmless in the sense that never have we wilfully or with a high hand sinned against God's law; blameless in moral integrity; harmless in holy sincerity; "unspotted from the world, by habitual resistance to its temptations. In this sense we can every one of us "keep innocency," and we may every one of us be the sons of God without rebuke.

There is a third error on the subject. Men purposely deceive themselves into the delusion that sin is not sin, or hardly sin. This is particularly true, as we daily see, of the sins of sense. Men say that they are not like maiden babes, that the evil tide of passion and of hot blood runs through their veins, that they are the victims of a corrupted heredity, full of proclivities to evil, conveyed to them through double lines of hundreds of thousands of ancestors, that they cannot help sinning. Now in the last assertion men lie to their own selves. It is true that we are every one of us inheritors of a weak and fallen nature, and that the sins of our fathers have made it more difficult for us to live holy lives. In some ways and in some

senses the old proverb of the Jews is true, that our teeth are set on edge by the sour grapes our fathers ate. I have read of a man, the son of an habitual drunkard, who for forty years had to keep a sleepless and agonising watch over his own lower propensities in order to resist the demon of drink, which had a powerful ally and advocate in his very blood; yet that man stood firm, and resisted to the very end, a true saint of God, for whom louder than for any ordinary saint all the trumpets shall sound on the other side. But God never sends a temptation, however strong, to any one of us without also providing the way of escape. No single man can say, "Innocence for me is simply impossible." Never let any one of you, however young, however inexperienced he be, be deceived by that false coin stamped from the devil's mint. Ring it on the counter of truth, and when you have heard its hollow chink, nail it to the counter as a worthless cheat. To say that we must sin is simply the blasphemy of the devil; it is to declare that God forbids us to do what we cannot help doing.

It is not impossible to keep innocence by perfect purity of life as well as in other ways. Many men have not stained their baptismal robes. Strong passion, when men plead it as an excuse for violations of God's law, simply means weak reason. Do not then confuse innocence with the absence of temptation. Temptation is not guilt. It is one thing to be tempted, another thing to fall. The consciousness of temptation does not make sinners, but the consenting to it. If the devil whispers to you, "No man can be wholly pure," he whispers to you a lie. By the grace of God thousands, and not Christians only, but Pagans, have been pure. "I confess it is my shame," says the weak lover in Shakespeare, "but it is not in my virtue to amend it." "Virtue!" replies the hardened villain, who yet has read nature by the light of experience! "Virtue, a fig! 'tis in ourselves that we are thus or thus. Our bodies are our gardens, to the which our wills are gardeners; so that if we will plant nettles, or sow lettuce, set hyssop, and weed up thyme, supply it with one gender of herbs, or distract it with many, either to have it sterile with idleness, or manured with industry, why, the power and corrigible authority of this lies in our wills. If the balance of our lives had not one scale of reason to poise another of sensuality, the blood and baseness of our natures would conduct us to most preposterous conclusions." But we have reason to check our carnal impulses. "Come, be a man." "It is merely a lust of the blood and a permission of the will." Such is the voice of experience, which echoes the teaching of Divine truth, and herein the voice of science, to which men in these days attach so vast an importance, is in fullest accordance with the voice of Scripture and of experience. Scripture says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Science says, as has been well expressed, "So far from losing by the repression of inherited passions, you gain a new and an unexhausted strength." Science tells us that a temperate life between youth and manhood is the surest promise of great force and firm endurance afterwards, that the repressed passion is not loss, but springs up as it were from the ground in fresh fountains of life and health. It is an infernal apostacy to imagine that sin is ever the source of strength. Sin is, and of its own nature always must be, weakness. The ordinary language of the world confesses it to be so. How does the world describe men who have lived impure or reckless lives? What does the word "profligate" mean but one who has been *profligatus*—dashed to the ground, utterly routed and overcome by his own passions? What does the word "dissolute" mean but one who has been dissolved, destroyed, melted away? What does the word "*roué*" mean but one who has been literally broken on the wheel? In the word "libertine" the world seems to claim a false freedom, but there is a grim irony in the claim, because a libertine, on the contrary, is one who has given up the freedom of righteousness, of service, which is perfect freedom, and has taken in exchange the grinding tyranny of sin.

I speak to many young men. To those who are not keeping innocency, or even trying to keep it, I say a reckless youth means a rueful age. You are drawing large profits on the capital of your life for which you will have to pay the uttermost farthing—ay, and cent. per cent. interest besides—in your later years; you are, as Carlyle told you, turning away in mad waste the divine aromas and plainly celestial elements from your existence; you are changing your holy of holies into a place of riot; you are making the soul itself hard, impious, barren; and you young men who do know how Divine is the blush of innocence on youthful cheeks, who are saving the noblest gifts of your youth for God, who know how high and beneficent as well as sternly inexorable is the duty herein laid upon you—yours is the freedom, yours the blessedness, yours all that is wise and lovely and of good report! Theirs, alas! is the stain and the weakness and the gloom and the shame. That which in the eye of religion is the highest worship is, it has been said, in the eye of science the wisest policy. Scripture speaks of "fleshly lusts that war against the soul." Science says with equal plainness, "If you would make the most of your life, if you would do your life's work in the best way, if you would have nothing to regret in your life afterwards, if you would leave to your children's children a heritage of health and force, you must be pure, you must abstain, you must give up." Integrity and purity, so far from meaning weakness, always mean strength and nobleness.

My good sword guards the course of men,
My trusty lance is sure,
My strength is as the strength of ten,
Because my heart is pure.

The arguments which I have touched upon against the possibilities of innocence are errors and deceits, but they do not represent the depths of Satan. When men become past feeling, when they have sold themselves to do evil, and to work all uncleanness with greediness, when they have become the tempters of others, when they deliberately try to break down the barrier of morality in the minds of men, they are the fools who make a mock at sin. Woe, deadliest of all woes which express God's extreme malediction, upon those who deny that sin is sinful, upon those who call evil good and good evil, who put darkness for light and light for darkness, who put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!

What, for instance, are we to think of those who bid young men sow their wild oats—in other words, indulge freely in the sins of their youth? We can only say that by such advice they gratuitously do the work of the devil—they make themselves devils to others. Be sure of this, every young man who hears me, that if you sow wild oats you will reap wild oats in your later life, bitter and poisonous, and which make the ground barren. Can you "gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles"? Can you pollute a fountain, and hope that the river will be clean? "Be not deceived: God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. He that soweth to the flesh shall also of the flesh reap corruption." Do you think that you can defy God's law as, and when, and just as long as you please, and escape the consequences, and recover when you like? Ask any man who ever lived whether he has escaped the consequences of his past sins. Look at history, and see how inevitably men's evil deeds come flowing back upon them in a slow, resistless tide from which no hand but that of Christ can pluck their drowning souls. Nay, ask the Spirit of Evil himself, and he will be forced to say to you, "I have not lied to you in this; I never told any one of you that you would escape the consequences of your sins." He would say, "There never has been a human victim since Adam and Eve lost Paradise from whom I have pretended to conceal that sin is death. I deceive not; your passions deceive you; you deceive yourselves. I do not deceive; I tempt." And as for recovering when you please, you might as well fling a light into a vast, dry prairie, and fancy that you can at any moment stop the conflagration. What is the meaning of your saying that you will sow your wild oats now? Is it not to say that because you are yet young you will insolently violate God's law, that you will bid God wait your time, that you will lay the flowers of your life as an offering on the altar of devils, and perhaps keep the ragged, senseless, withered, canker-eaten leaves of your decrepitude for God? If you thus laugh in God's face is He likely to bless you? Is He likely to make your road smooth for you? Does not His very love make it necessary for Him to punish and plague you? Can you touch pitch and not be defiled? Can you take fire in your hand and not be burned? Oh, I would entreat you, do not in your youthful self-conceit be so utter and so terrible a fool! Do not go with your eyes open against all the experience of all the world in every age, like a bird to the lure of the fowler, like an ox to the slaughter, like a fool to the correction of the stocks. Once give up the control of your reason and your conscience, once snatch your hand from the grasp of those two great archangels to which God has entrusted the holy guardianship of your youth, once leap into the chariot of passion, and fling loose the reins upon the necks of your youthful lusts, and then the pace is mad, and the steeds are frantic, and the course is downhill already, and it ends in a precipice at last. "Keep innocency," then, because in God's strength and by God's aid there is not one of you who cannot keep it. Nobody says that you can do it of your own strength, but you are not asked to do it of your own strength. If you try that impossibility you will ignominiously fail; but God is eager to give you grace, and great grace, and with that help you can keep your precious birthright of innocence, that eternal jewel of your souls. Every voice which would persuade you that you cannot is the voice of the Father of Lies.

But if you need further reasons why you should make this effort, let me briefly give you three. I would say first, "keep innocency," because it is infinitely more easy to "keep innocency" than to recover it when it is lost. No; it never can be wholly recovered. Hence that golden rule, *obsta principiis*—resist the beginnings of evil! It has pleased God to place a hedge round our first sins. At first sin seems to us to be naturally revolting, a hideous alien from our nature, for innocence is Nature's wisdom. The dove flutters when the hawk is in the air; the young steed rears on its haunches when it hears the arrows hiss. Oh, surer than suspicion's hundred eyes is that fine sense which to the pure in heart by mere oppugnancy of their own goodness reveals the approach of evil! That is why the forces of evil try so hard to familiarise the soul with the thought of sin, and so break down the moral barriers of reserve. They try to make sin seductive to the imagination; they surround it for those who are willing to be tempted with all kinds of glamour; they make the scorching wilderness bright with the mirage; they paint the gates of hell with paradise; with all their might they say to the still trembling, wavering soul of youth, "Only this once be mine, and sin for one short hour, and then be all thy life the happiest man of men." If they can entangle you in one sin, in the first sin, they know by long experience that nine-tenths of their work is done. One sin will lead to others of a different character, or even if the one sin remain one in kind, it would be more than enough to drag you into perdition, because

the poisonous flower of that one bosom sin will twine around and choke and strangle all that is best and noblest within you. But it will not remain one sin. The devils know that sins are linked together by innumerable links. "Whom," asks St. Augustine, "didst thou ever see content with a single sin?" A great English writer in a pathetic passage, speaking of a youth leaving his home in which he has been sheltered, asks why no angel warned him in the hour of peril. "O heaven," he says, "that it should be possible for a youth not seventeen years old, by a momentary blindness, by listening to a false, false whisper from his young bewildered heart, by an erring step, by a motion this way or that, to change the currents of his destiny, to poison the fountains of his peace, and in the twinkling of an eye to lay the foundation of a life-long repentance!" But is there no angel? Is not conscience a warning angel to us all? What man among you has ever sinned unwarned? Which of you all, if you have yielded your members servants to unrighteousness, can say before the angels, "It was an error"? Ah, no, my brethren! and therefore, if there be any point in which you have been tempted and have not yielded either in will or deed, "keep innocency," and hold fast still to that innocence; let nothing rob you of it. Every effort of resistance will make you stronger to hold it till at last you are irresistible, even as the savage believes that into his own arm passes the strength of every warrior whom he has slain.

And I would say to you, secondly, "keep innocency" because all the wholeness and wholesomeness, the strength and consistent unity of your life, depend on it. A man may repent of sin. Thank God! repentance is always open, but a man never will, and never can, be the same again—never can be all that he might have been if he had won that first battle. Even if the wound be healed up, the scar remains. There is not that sweet congruity in his life which there might have been. The disease may have been cured, but it has left him weaker; he is always most vulnerable at that point—one joint in his harness has been terribly widened for "the fiery darts of the Wicked One."

Once more I would bid you strive to "keep innocency" because to lose it is certain misery, for the loss of innocence is shame, and there is no hotter fire in hell than the fire of shame. Have you ever felt utterly, entirely, inexcusably ashamed of yourself? Have you ever had the hide of self-satisfaction so pierced by some arrow of conviction as to be forced into the confession that you have been a fool, a hopeless fool, and, worst of all, a guilty fool? Have you ever heard the accusing voices of inner witnesses overwhelming you with reproach, and have had no syllable to answer? Have you ever seen the accusing finger pointing to a cowardly, guilty, infamous thing, leprous all over with malice and meanness and vice, and in that abject thing have you seen yourself? If so, you know something of what hell is, for there has been in your hearts a sluice of that red fire of Phlegethon. When Dante sees the carnal offenders in the flame of purgatory, every blush of shame at the mention of their past evil deeds adds a fresh intensity to the fire, though it was so hot that in passing through it Dante says, "I could have flung myself into molten glass for coolness." And how terribly does Milton describe the moment of awakenment after our first parents had tasted the forbidden fruit!

> Up they rose
> As from unrest, and each the other viewing,
> Soon found their eyes how open'd, and their minds
> How darkened; innocence that as a veil
> Had shadowed them from knowing ill was gone;
> Just confidence and native righteousness,
> And honour from about them, naked left
> To guilty shame.

Here I must conclude. Only let me add that when I consider how terrible a thing the loss of innocence is I cannot be sufficiently amazed at the awful levity with which many men fling it away, recklessly barter it, perhaps, even in early youth, for some momentary gratification of less value than Esau's mess of pottage, fling it away for some Dead Sea apple, fair only on the rind, but full within of dust and bitterness; fling it away for a fancy, for a moment, for a nothing, perhaps even for some impossibility, some might have been, for some rag which their soul covets, but can never wear. Oh! I entreat you, "keep innocency." You need not ask how. God has long ago taught every one of you how to keep it if only you desire to do so. Keep it by continuous effort, by watchfulness, by prayer, by distinct will, by resolute purpose; intend to keep it, vow to keep it, will to keep it in Christ's service by God's grace. Without this resolution and watchfulnes you will certainly lose it. You are surrounded by enemies human and spiritual, and you yourself—

> This prophet with prophetic voice
> That pleads for sloth, and ease, and joys

—you are yourself your own worst enemy. How can a man conquer his enemies if he does not mean to fight them? Your enemies never sleep. If you sleep, and without the armour God has given you, of course they will wound you, of course they will take you captive. And to this effort against temptation you must add careful avoidance of temptation. Pray "Lead us not into temptation," and live in the spirit of your prayer, and you will be safe. Pray "Vouchsafe, O Lord, to keep me this day without sin," and act in the spirit of your prayer, and God will keep you; but if you seek temptation, if you perversely thrust yourself in the way of temptation, if you listen to the voice which bids you cast yourself down from the pinnacle of temptation where you have set yourself, how can you possibly escape? In that case you will not escape, but will fall miserably to your own ruin. You want to be honest. Are you likely to

be honest if you bet and gamble and tamper with those dishonest excitements, and are thus tempted by your own headstrong folly to cheat and to rob? You want to be pure. How can you possibly be pure if you purposely inflame your own lower passions by morbid imaginations, and with a guilty curiosity seek out and read the leprous literature which was written by the vilest of the devil's servants with the express object of corrupting you? You want to be God's children. How can you be if you choose bad companions, if you listen with pleasure to evil conversation, if you stand in the way of sinners and sit in the seat of the scornful? How can you be if you turn your back on churches, if you never receive the Holy Sacrament, if you seek no aid and advice from those who would gladly give it you, if you quench within yourself all the more spiritual aspirations, neglect and do despite to the appointed means of grace? Innocence, rectitude, holiness, even ordinary morality, are not to be had on those terms. If you want to "keep innocency" you must value it above rubies, you must hold it fast as your most precious gift and crown. Innocent men are simply the strongest, noblest, purest, sweetest, whom the earth has seen! Why should not you be of their glorious number? Why should not your soul also be pure as the Eastern sapphire with heaven's own blue? There have been by God's grace ten thousand times ten thousand such, and thousands of thousands. "These are they who are arrayed in white robes, with palms in their hands, who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, in fine linen, white and clean"—the strong, the faithful, the undefiled. Would you join them, going on from strength to strength till, with everlasting joy upon your heads, every one of you appeareth before the God of gods in Zion? It is open to you; it is possible to you, by God's free gift and grace, if you "Keep innocency and take heed to the thing that is right, for that shall bring a man peace at the last."

THE Chapter of Chester have elected Canon Fielden as their Proctor in the Convocation of York in the place of Canon Hillyard, whose resignation had been accepted by the Archbishop of York.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 18, 1890.

RURAL DEANS.

THERE is no class of men whose position is so anomalous in the present condition of our established Church, as that of Rural Deans. We believe that, properly speaking, the Rural Dean should be the senior incumbent of each group of ten churches, and we believe that in some instances this is even the case, but in by far the largest number of localities we find a very different state of affairs existing. We said that Rural Deans occupied an anomalous position, and this we maintain must be the case both from the various and very divergent methods adopted for their appointment, and also from the fact that the difference between the offices performed by them is most marked. The Rural Dean of to-day has to try as far as possible to fall in with two extremely opposite conditions. In the first place, he must seek to exercise the functions which, at an earlier period in our church's history seem to have been practised by those functionaries, and generally to assert an authority for, and raise the standard of, an effete and almost obsolete rank; and, in the second place, Rural Deans as men have to consider their position among their fellow incumbents, and to be wise in meeting an ever-increasing tendency on the part of the clergy to assert their own independence, and to maintain their individual rights to absolute authority in their various cures. The Rural Dean, then, in order to meet the requirements of the case, must be one whose bearing and position will enable him to be absolutely *primus inter pares*, and will enable him to exercise his authority; and at the same time he must be one who, during a considerable period, has shown

by the whole tenor of his clerical life that *he* certainly can in no way be accused of a prying, inquisitive, or domineering disposition. Such qualities are rarely to be found in the same man, and so, as a rule, it happens that this post either becomes the sinecure of some well-to-do local rector, whose sole duty is to make his house the beloved centre of conviviality at certain periods of the year, and either not troubling about, or leaving to the Archdeacon or Bishop, the various functions which he is expected to perform, or it falls to the share of one who, on the other hand, is greatly impressed with the reverence accorded to the office in the pre-Reformation period, and therefore seeks to arrogate to himself a far more dignified place than his clerical brethren are prepared to accord him. Men of this class are for the most part looked upon as ecclesiastical spies, and often earn the contempt of those amongst whom they seek to obtain honour.

The appointment of Rural Deans accords truly with these two phases of character. In some parts the Rural Dean is appointed solely by the Bishop of the diocese, in which case he is generally the most wealthy incumbent in the neighbourhood, and is, of course, the one whose natural tendency to hospitality has won him the good opinion of his Bishop. Others are *elected*, and this seems to us the best method of procedure, and we only wish that all Bishops would delegate their right to appoint, and would thus really render this office useful by enabling those interested, to themselves elect one in whom they have sufficient confidence to allow him to take some interest in the conduct of affairs in their parishes. This process gives a *locus standi* to the man appointed, and at the same time prevents his being an object of odium to the clergy of his Rural Deanery; in this case neither wealth nor dignity would be absolute in the matter, but rather the popularity which comes from kindliness of feeling, and which ought to be the characteristic especially of Rural Deans.

THE *Record* understands that the Rev. J. H. Keen, for some years senior curate of Christ Church, Spitalfields, has been invited by the Church Missionary Society to join the North Pacific Mission. Mr. Keen has accepted the proposal, and hopes to leave for Queen Charlotte's Islands about the end of April.

THE sudden death, from typhoid fever, of the Rev. George Stopford Ram, vicar of St. Peter's, Bournemouth, excited widespread sympathy, which has taken the form of a testimonial to his widow, the Hon. Mrs. Charlotte Ram. Over £2,000 has been subscribed by members of all the religious persuasions in Bournemouth as a tribute to his memory.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE DIACONATE.

A PAPER BY THE REV. JOHN J. COLEMAN, M.A., OF DULVERTON, SOMERSET.

(*Continued from page* 22.)

IN making our inquiry into the duties of the deacon in the Primitive Church we divided them into two classes. Let us now, in order to make our proposed comparison by the result of such inquiry, adhere to the same division, and compare the duties we found to belong to each class with the duties specified in the above extract from our Ordinal.

The former of those two classes of duties consisted of the dispensing of the alms of the Church, under the presidency of the bishop, amongst the necessitous. This duty we find represented, or rather faintly shadowed, in the last clause of the above extract, which does not seem to contemplate the administration of any definite Church funds by the deacon, but only a search for the necessitous for the information of the curate, that he may procure the necessary alms for their relief. And it is well known that in practice the administration of the alms of the Church, provided for the relief of the poor, is retained by the curate in his own hands, and is only very partially committed to the deacon of the present day. By such practice the curate is, in spite of the provision to the contrary made by the institution of the Diaconate, involved in secular matters to the hindrance of employments more important and more proper to his office as a presbyter, and the chief purpose, or one of the chief purposes in the establishment of the order of deacons as a part of the Apostolic Ministry, becomes frustrated.

The latter of the above-mentioned two classes of duties we connected with the government, the worship, and the spiritual ministrations of the Church. In the above catalogue of diaconal duties we find no mention made of any belonging to the government of the Church such as we saw were executed by primitive deacons, neither is there in practice any provision made for the employment of deacons in exercising Church discipline, in assisting at diocesan synods, or at provincial councils, or in any work akin to that of making inquiries, with a view to the maintenance of discipline, into the antecedents of strangers who pass from parish to parish and from diocese to diocese, and who claim to be admitted to the Communion of the Church.

We saw that a considerable part of the primitive deacon's duties lay in making the necessary provision for the orderly and regular conduct of public worship; but in the extract we have made above from the Ordination Service we look in vain for any directions given to the candidate for the Diaconate as to the performance of those or of kindred duties. And, indeed, in our practice, such duties as we have specified above in connection with this particular branch of the deacon's office, so far as they are now performed amongst us, are, some of them, allotted to churchwardens, whilst others are performed indifferently by presbyters and deacons.

Of the duties which we ascertained as attaching to the Diaconate in primitive times under the heading of the more spiritual functions of the office, we find several recognised, more or less, in the above list of duties taken from the Ordination Service. The

administration of the Cup, the reading of the Gospel, the offering up of prayer, the giving of exhortations during the progress of Divine Service, the bringing of gifts to the Altar, and the preparation for the celebration of the Eucharist—these ministrations we may take to be comprehended in the statement that it belongs to the deacon "to assist the priest in Divine Service, and especially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof, and to read Holy Scriptures in the Church." The administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, which, as we have seen, does not of right belong to the office of a deacon, but which was performed by deacons under certain conditions, is mentioned in our list as belonging to the office, with this limitation: "in the absense of the priest to baptize infants." Hence, it would appear that the ordinary delegation here implied does not carry with it the right to baptize *adults*, and that, to say the least, some special authorisation would be required before a deacon could, without being guilty of irregularity, administer this Sacrament to an adult; but in our practice of the present day, whereby deacons baptize infants in Church or in private houses, if only the priest be not present at the time in the Church or in the private house, even though the ministrations of a priest be quite obtainable, we cannot be said to be acting in accordance with the primitive precedents, or, probably, within the meaning of the limitations stated in the Ordination Service. The right of preaching, which was not in the primitive ages, as we have seen, exercised by deacons though the practice would seem to have been allowed, more or less, in course of time with the bishop's permission (Robertson's Hist. of Christian Church i., 427), is stated to belong to the deacon's office, with the proviso, "if he be admitted thereto by the bishop," the practice, with but few exceptions, being to allow the deacon to preach as a matter of course.

We have seen that some of the duties of the Diaconate were appropriated and restricted to one of its members, who was called an "archdeacon;" but when we look for the office among ourselves we find that the title is borne by one who is always a presbyter, and that the diaconal duties of the office have almost disappeared, and as the ordinary duties of the presbyter are too unrestrictedly assumed by the deacon, so one or more of the duties of the bishop are assumed by the functionary who is an archdeacon in name.

It will be evident that both in theory and practice the exercise of the Diaconate, as it is now developed and circumstanced, in some respects falls short of, and in others goes somewhat beyond, the functions of the office as they are represented to us in the writings of early Christian times, from which information is derived to us.

If, however, the Order of Deacons was instituted under Divine direction or inspiration, and for the purpose of supplying particular needs and requirements of the Church, and if, as has been held from the earliest ages, the Diaconate is of perpetual obligation in the Church Catholic, it will be admitted that it is of the highest importance to preserve the office and its functions in every age the same in principle, and, so far as possible, in practice, as they appear to have existed in primitive times, and, in those particulars in which principle and practice have been infringed, to restore the primitive type.

III. Hence we come now to the third chief division of our subject, in which it will be our endeavour to suggest certain points in the direction of which the present state of the Diaconate might be altered, with the view of bringing it more nearly into agreement with its primitive condition.

In order to effect this object it would be necessary to give a permanent character to the Diaconate, and, in the ordinary course, to impart such finality to the deacon's appointment that it may cease to be regarded as the novitiate for the presbyterate, and that wordly advancement may not be a cause of attraction from the Diaconate to the presbyterate. It does not enter into the scope of this paper to discuss how this can be arranged without difficulty from a financial point of view. Doubtless, by a slight adjustment of the existing funds at the disposal of the Church, such difficulty might be surmounted.

To the Cathedral Church, and to certain central churches throughout the diocese, a defined district might be apportioned, and at each of such churches a certain number of deacons, according to the requirements of its apportioned district, might be located, each of whom should have a certain number of parishes under his administration. These deacons should be under the immediate jurisdiction of the archdeacon in whose archdeaconry their respective districts are situated, the archdeacon being in future, not a presbyter or bishop, but a deacon. Moreover, those deacons who were appointed to the Cathedral Church might, if a certain Act of Parliament were repealed, occupy prebendal stalls and be prebendary deacons. Thus, by the appointments to the archdeaconries and to the Cathedral Church the bishop would have it in his power to recognise and reward deacons who had pre-eminently "used the office of a deacon well." And the deacons would have some prospect of advance after faithful service to "a good degree.'

Deacons appointed in accordance with the suggestions above made would be in a position to execute the duties of their office in accordance with the principles of the Primitive Church ascertained by the functions which were exercised by the Primitive Diaconate.

It remains for us to point out the nature of the duties which will devolve upon deacons constituted in the manner above suggested if the exercise of the office is to be brought into closer accord with primitive practice.

In order to indicate such duties let us follow the same division of diaconal functions which we made in our inquiry into those of the Primitive Diaconate: (i) Duties connected with the secular requirements of the Church; (ii) Duties attaching to the Church's (1) government, (2) worship, and (3) spiritual ministrations.

(i) In order to restore to the Diaconate the duties belonging to this branch of its office, and to enable it to fulfil the primary purpose for which it would appear to have been instituted, viz., the relief of the higher orders of the Apostolic Ministry from the pressure of the less spiritual cares of the ministry (assuming that the setting apart of "the Seven" was the institution of this Order), a considerable change would be necessary upon the present conception of the duties of this office.

Alms and other offerings of the people might be placed under the control of the deacon, to whose administration the particular parish was attached, in those cases in which they were intended for a parochial

object ; and where they were to be devoted to extra-parochial objects, they might be subject to the immediate supervision of the archdeacon. Funds for the supply of additional clergy, for the promotion of the building of churches and of the building and support of church schools, and for the missionary work of the Church, might be placed under the management of the archdeacon and his deacons. In the case of alms for the poor the deacon would have the dispensing of the same, in the several parishes under his administration, subject to the direction of the parish priest. By the performance of these kindred duties the Diaconate would relieve that pressure of secular cares upon the priests of large town parishes, which is a great hindrance to their fulfilment of the more proper and spiritual duties of their office, and by the dispensing of the alms for the benefit of the poor, the deacon would be taking from between every parish priest and the poor of his charge what is often a hindrance to the dealing with their souls and also a cause of estrangement between them.

(ii). We have now to inquire what duties belonging to the second class into which we have divided them may be allotted to the Diaconate in order to bring it in closer agreement with its primitive mode.

1. In the government of the Church deacons should take an important part as regards the enforcement of discipline upon her lay members. The deacons, with the archdeacon as president, might hear the evidence in such cases and report upon the same to the bishop, with whom the archdeacons of the diocese might be associated, if the cases were subsequently brought before the bishop for his adjudication.

According to ancient precedent another duty connected with Church government which might be granted to certain elected members of the Diaconate of each diocese, together with the archdeacons, is that of sitting with the bishop and presbyters in diocesan and provincial synods.

2. In matters concerning the arrangements for public worship deacons might have the principal management and authority. The disposal of the congregation in sittings, the charge of the fabric of the Church, of the bells, of the sacred vessels, and of church furniture and ornaments,—all these duties might be superintended and controlled, if not always actually performed, by deacons.

3. As regards the exercise of the more strictly spiritual functions of the Diaconate, some alterations and modifications of modern practice would be necessary, if it is to be brought into closer and more faithful imitation of that presented by the primitive ages of the Church.

In the celebration and administration of the Eucharist, the deacon would bring the alms and offerings and the bread and wine to the priest at the Altar ; he would read the Epistle or Gospel or both ; according to the analogy of primitive practice, he might read the longer and shorter address to communicants, and lead the Confession ; but it would appear to be not quite regular for a deacon to present alms and offerings upon the Altar, and, by consequence, to offer the prayer for the Church militant when alms and oblations are to be offered ; lastly, he would follow the priest with the Cup in the distribution of the Sacrament, and, if the present rules of the Church were somewhat relaxed, it would be competent to him, according to the practice of the earliest days, to carry this Sacrament to persons unable to attend the House of God (Justin Martyr Apol. i. 65-67).

As regards the administration of baptism, we have seen that the right to perform it does not appear to be inherent in the deacon's office, but that it arises from special delegation by the bishop. Hence, seeing that by the statement of our Ordination Service, in which the duties of the deacon are set out, the right to administer baptism is by implication given by the bishop to every deacon ordained with that service (restricted, however, in its exercise by these words : "in the absence of the priest to baptize *infants*"), it follows that the deacon has no right, without a special delegation of authority, either to baptize adults or to baptize infants, except in an emergency, when the ministrations of a priest cannot be procured. Thus an instance could hardly be imagined as arising in England, where there are an abundance of priests, of a baptism in *Church* being with propriety performed by a deacon.

We have seen that the office of preaching, like the right to administer baptism, was not originally considered to belong, as of course, to the Diaconate, and, where the preaching of deacons is mentioned by the earliest writers who refer to the subject, they preached only when specially authorised by the bishop. Hence it would seem right, and possibly advisable, that the circumstances of every particular case should govern the giving or the withholding of permission to a deacon to preach.

It may be open to question whether or not a deacon should perform the Service for the Burial of the Dead, or that for the Churching of Women ; but, seeing that it belongs not to his office to bless, it follows, apart from other considerations, that he is not competent to perform the Marriage Service. From the nature of the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, it is evident that a deacon is not competent to fulfil its requirements.

The more important remaining duties belonging to the Diaconate, connected with this branch of our subject, would be the saying of morning and evening prayers, the Litany, the reading of homilies, and the catechising of children, but probably not the ministration of the Commination Service.

It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the details of the plan by which such a change as is hereby advocated, in the present use of the Diaconate, might be effected ; but it may reasonably be expected to contain some suggestions concerning the source whence the members of this re-constituted Diaconate might be supplied, the manner of their appointment, their qualifications, and their position.

In order to form a body from whence this permanent Diaconate could be supplied, it might be desirable to re-institute the order of sub-deacons which would form a suitable novitiate for the Diaconate. And it might be an advantage that all who are intending to become deacons should pass through this novitiate, whether they are to be admitted to the Diaconate, with the intention of remaining permanently in it, or of proceeding in due course to the priesthood. From this sub-Diaconate, or from those already in deacon's orders, the persons might be elected to fill vacancies in the permanent Diaconate. Election by "the multitude of the disciples"—the communicants—residing within the several parishes to be placed under the administration of the deacon to be elected, sanctioned with the consent of the archdeacon and bishop, would seem to afford a suitable, and also a primitive, mode of appointment.

The various duties which we have seen would

tach to the members of this restored Diaconate, would render it necessary that they should be men of good educational equipment and of sound judgment. Hence the present standard and scope of scholarship should not be lessened, but rather, in some directions, should they be raised and extended; and the minimum limit of age might be raised, perhaps with advantage, to twenty-five, the same as that fixed in the Primitive Church.

The position of these permanent deacons must, no doubt, be assured to them; and their pay must be made sufficient to remove the necessity for their proceeding to the priesthood, in order to obtain higher remuneration. Their appointment therefore should be similar, in its security, to a parochial benefice, and the stipend attached should be equal in value to an average incumbency. With this provision for an assured position and for adequate payment, the permanent deacon would not have, ordinarily, the temptation to desire advance to the priesthood, for the purpose of obtaining a larger stipend, either as an assistant priest or even as an incumbent of a parochial benefice.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR," January, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE first volume of the Fourth Series opens with an article on the "Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel" by the late Bishop of Durham. In his stately style, Dr. Lightfoot shows the moral impossibility of any second century forger keeping silence about the then burning questions of the episcopate, of gnostic theories of emanations, or of the time of keeping Easter. A line would have influenced, not to say settled, any one of the three, but the nameless, purposeless forger refrained; a very genius amongst forgers! Then Dr. Lightfoot shows how the style betrays that the writer was thinking in Hebrew, or rather in Aramaic, while he wrote in Greek, that he was one who read the Hebrew Scriptures rather than the Septuagint, and that he possessed a knowledge of places and persons more than could be expected from a Gentile or Hellenistic Christian. All this and more we have, and how much more we *might* have had. May the late Bishop's contemporary and friend—he who is now almost the last, and certainly the mightiest of the few fitted to teach the teachers—not be turned aside from that office which none other can discharge as he discharges it, to the routine and detail of a diocese which any one of a hundred other men are equally competent to administer.

Professor Beet begins his article on "Eternal Punishment" with an apology for re-opening the subject. We do not accept the apology, and find no further reason for doing so after reading what he has to say, for the question is bigger than one that can be settled by what words an apostle may use; it is all λογομαχία.

Mr. Carr has a very ingenious note on St. Philip's calculation. It is just one of those undesigned coincidences which would have delighted the late Professor Blunt, not merely because it shows the apostle making a quick calculation nearly, but not perfectly right, but still more because it shows that the question was asked by Christ of the man able to answer it.

Mr. D'Arcy, writing on Micaiah's vision, seems to solve a very manufactured difficulty only. Dr. Cox seems to us to take quite a mistaken view of St. James, when he writes that "he never regarded Jesus as more than the Jewish Messiah, or the Gospel as more than the fulfilling of the Law." Professor Cheyne writes on the 26th and 28th Psalms, and Principal Dykes on St. John vii. 11-29. But, except the first, none of the articles this month are up to the usual level of the *Expositor*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—Up to the present no one has attempted to show any invalidity in the syllogism which I put forth on the above subject in the PULPIT of the 14th December. I therefore conclude that the syllogism is impregnable. Properly, then, I should not trouble you with another letter on the subject until that syllogism has been impugned; but as it is perfectly unreasonable to run away with a notion until they have adequately met all the difficulties that stand opposed to it, might I venture to draw the attention of your correspondents to it again.

The smoke of the torment of the wicked is said to ascend up "for ever and ever" (Rev. xiv. 11; xx. 10); and God is said to live "for ever and ever" (Rev. iv. 9). Now what is the conclusion? The phrase used to express the endless existence of the Deity is "for ever," or "for ever and ever."

The righteous are said to "reign for ever and ever"; but this along with the "torment of the wicked" is for "ever and ever," and what is the conclusion? or put it along with "God liveth for ever and ever," and what is the conclusion? The phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων means for the ages of *all* the ages; but *one* of these αἰῶνες is the αἰὼν mentioned in Deut. xxxii. 40, which is used to point out the endless existence of God. It is impossible for any human being who wishes to be honest with himself, and consistent with reason and common sense in the pursuit of truth, to get rid of this thought, that one of the ages here mentioned is the endless age of God's existence.

The only attempt at a reply to this is in Mr. Murphy's letter of 28th December, wherein he says that "the ages of ages will end in the ultimate glory, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father" (1 Cor. xv. 24). But we have seen above that this is impossible to be true. There is no connection for *his* purpose between Rev. xi. 15 and 1 Cor. xv. 24; the former asserts that "Christ will reign for ever and ever," and the latter that "He shall deliver up the mediatorial kingdom to the Father"; but there is not a word in either text about the cessation of the ages. Does he not know that when the mediatorial kingdom shall have been "delivered up" that Christ shall reign for ever and ever. "But unto the *Son* he saith, Thy throne, O *God*, is for *ever and ever*." Besides, Mr. Murphy's chronology is sadly at fault, and his notion opposed to the sequence of events. In 1 Cor. xv. 22 we read: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," which means that all men shall be raised again with their bodies.

The Judgment comes after the Resurrection. "I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books" (Rev. xx. 12). After the judging comes the sentence: "Whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire." *Then* cometh the end of the mediatorial kingdom after the "devil, and the beast, and the false prophet, and every one whose name was not written in the Book of Life shall have been cast into the lake of fire and brimstone to be tormented for *ever and ever*" (Rev. xx. 10-15). It is *subsequent* to the giving up of the mediatorial kingdom that they are said to be tormented for "ever and ever." Nothing can be plainer than this. To say that the "ages of ages" will end at the giving up of the mediatorial kingdom would involve the cessation of the existence of the Deity, and I am sure that Mr. Murphy is not so unreasonable as to expect that that would come to pass in order to accommodate his theory. A moment's consideration of the context of Rev. xi. 15 would show that the reigning of Christ "for ever and ever" is *subsequent* to the giving up of His mediatorial kingdom, because the phrase, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ" implies the *triumph* and the *end* of His mediatorial work; in accordance with which "the four-and-twenty elders worship God by saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned; and thy wrath is come, *and the time of the dead that they should be judged*, and that thou should'st give *reward* unto thy servants, small and great." After the judging comes the reigning, as seen above, "for ever and ever."

Bishop Pearson says: "*Then* cometh the end, when all the enemies of Christ shall be subdued, when all the chosen of God shall be actually brought into His kingdom; that is, when the whole office of Mediator shall be completed, then every branch of its execution shall cease; yet we must not think that Christ shall cease to be King. The kingdoms of the world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever, *not only to the modificated eternity of His Mediatorship, but also to the complete eternity of the duration of His humanity, which for the future is co-eternal to His divinity.*" It is easy to see from this quotation how that eminent scholar and theologian understood Rev. xi. 15. That it is impossible ever to escape from hell after having once had the awful misfortune to go there is evident from the representations made of it in Scripture. Take, for instance, Rev. xiv. 10, 11: "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation." Mark the quality of the wrath; its being *poured* out shows the abundance of it, and without *mixture* shows that it is without the least drop of mercy to allay the extremity of their torment. It is called a cup of indignation to show that it is not the *correction* of a Father, which is accompanied with lenity and love, but the *vengeance* of a Judge. The effect of their drinking this cup is their being *tormented* with fire and brimstone, which expression denotes the torments to be exquisite, both intolerable and interminable, *easeless* and *endless*. The *eternity* of the torment is pointed out by the smoke ascending up for ever and ever. Could any description of punishment be more terrible to human imagination. It shows that there is nothing corrective nor reformatory, nothing ameliorative. All is pure wrath, wrath "without mixture." That man would have a hardy soul indeed, but one sadly deluded by its own fancies, who could have the faintest expectation of being fitted for heaven by going through hell, after such a description as the above. *Physical* "burnings" and "castigations" cannot in the nature of things purify the human soul, the grace of God alone can do that; but then there is no grace in hell, because it is "wrath *without mixture*." No Holy Spirit to enable them to repent and believe, no Saviour to save them, because all is "wrath *without mixture*." Of the same import are the words of St. Paul in Rom. ii. 3-9, where he speaks of "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," being rendered at the "day of wrath to every one that doeth evil." These are plain texts of Scripture, and others more obscure should be interpreted by *them*. "Momentous processes for objects beneficial" to the sufferers are here totally and for ever excluded.

"J. B.'s" manner of treating this question forces the impression on a person that the prevailing dispositions of his mind are to assert without proof and to believe without reason, rejecting all evidence that goes against his side of the question. He appears "to bear his hopes above wisdom, grace, and fear." He has not told us what he will do with the "fixed, impassable gulf" in the parable of Dives and Lazarus; nor has he said a word about the people whom St. Paul speaks of in Heb. x. 26, for whom "there remaineth *no more sacrifice for sins*, but a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation"; nor about the person mentioned by St. James in chap. ii. 13, who is to "have judgment *without mercy*." Equally silent is he about the non-reversal of the sentence, "Depart from me"; but he goes behind the decree of God and beyond the Judgment-day, and talks as if he were inspired about "momentous processes," an expression vague enough to cover anything, but nothing at all pertinent to the question. In former letters I showed that his notion could not be contained in certain texts which he then quoted; it is passing strange that he had not then a word to say about the interpretation which I gave of those texts, but now he reproduces those same texts in his letter of the 14th December. The limits of this letter will not permit me to notice them now, but I hope, D.V., with your permission, to take them up separately and examine them in a few letters, leaving your readers to judge on which side the truth lies. However, I cannot close this letter without calling attention to the non-theological statement of his canonical friend: "I sincerely honour every attempt to make the divine love triumph over every obstacle." May I ask *who* is to "*make*" the divine love triumph? Is it "J. B."? or his canonical friend? If God does not "make" His own love to triumph, who else can "make" it?

R. DONALDSON.

January 9th, 1890.

SIR,—From the correspondence which has appeared in the PULPIT on the subject of Everlasting Punishment and the Day of Grace, one would think that the teachings of Christ are to be taken *cum grano salis*; that, in point of fact, we are to re-judge God's justice and "be the gods of God." I cannot interpret the letter of "Presbyter" in last week's PULPIT, nor the letters of "J. B." and others on the same side, in any other sense. Either Christ said what He meant, or He did not. If He did He knew the full meaning of the language He employed. And how a *Christian*

can throw any doubt on the words of the Lord passes my comprehension. I say with the Apostle, "Let God be true and every man a liar."

What answer, I would ask, can those gentlemen who argue against the eternity of punishment, and contend that the day of grace extends into the next world, make to the following passages in the Gospel of Matthew, for instance: Matt. v. 29, 30; viii. 22, 23; xiii. 30, 49, 50; xviii. 8, 9; xxv. 46? Is there in any of these passages a word that would imply that the death of man in this world does not seal his final state? Does not each passage point to the conclusion that "as the tree falleth so it lieth," and that "there is no repentance in the grave"? Do these passages not indicate, as clearly as language can express it, that the punishment is everlasting, and that he who dies in his sins has the door of repentance closed against him for ever?

The kingdom of purgatory—for that is the kingdom that these gentlemen desire to uphold—was a discovery of the 13th century. Nothing was known of it before that. And its discovery was the source of much wealth and power to the Roman Catholic Church, and is so still, but it is a huge fraud, and is a source of the most frightful evil and sin, and has been and is a horrible curse to mankind. Do these correspondents of yours wish to spread the evil, and damn more souls than are being damned daily?

Let them take sentiment out of the question, and look at it in the light of the Gospel statements; then they may begin to realise the awful responsibility which rests upon them. Let them not be "blind leaders of the blind," like the priests of the Roman Catholic Church, but let them accept the teachings of Christ, as in our Revised New Testament, and it will be better for them and better for the people here and hereafter.

JOHN A. WALKER.

Dublin.

"PERFECTLY ABSURD."

SIR,—I find in the PULPIT of to-day a reply to the statements made in last Saturday's number by "Presbyter" and myself. On reading it I am greatly perplexed, as, after repeated efforts, I am unable to perceive, that the sentences before me have any legitimate application to the subject under discussion. They appear to me hopelessly incoherent.

The question I have attempted to bring forward, and which appeared quite clear to the mind of "Presbyter," is not whether men die happy or unhappy, but whether at the close of life they are prepared for a safe, holy, and happy immortality.

The word *Atonement* only occurs once in the Authorised Version of the New Testament. In Rom. v. 11 we read "by whom we have now received the *Atonement*." In the Revised Version it is rendered "through whom we have now received the *reconciliation*." In the Vulgate the word is rendered *reconciliatio*; in Luther's translation it is *versöhnung*, which means reconciliation. In Cruden's Concordance, edition of 1805, it is stated, under the head of *Atonement*, that it means, 1st, reconciliation or appeasing of anger; 2nd, a ransom, as in Job xxxiii. 24.

The text Col. 1 20 declaring the purpose of God "having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile all things to Himself," is, to my mind, a clear announcement that the Atonement or reconciliation will be applied to *all*, which I understand to be Universalism.

The inquiry is made by the writer of the sentences to which I am referring, "What about sin and Satan?. . . and what is implied by treading his enemies under his feet?" I consider it imperative on our part to interpret the texts about sin, Satan, hell, and all punishment of sin, in a manner consistent with the glorious design of God, which appears to me so clearly made known, in numerous passages, to deliver all His creatures from sin, and to unite them to Himself in loving communion. When it is said that Christ will destroy the works of the Devil, it evidently means that He will destroy sin, as there is no other work of the Devil that we know of.

There is no justice in alleging or insinuating that "Universalists were all agreed that the Atonement was only a pretty theory." They regard it as a glorious fact on which our hopes of salvation are built; they know of no other basis on which to found hope. It not only inspires hope, but the warmest love. "We love Him because He first loved us. . .While we were enemies, Christ died for us. . .We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us."

In the remarks under comment, it is said, "Either salvation is by the Atonement, or it is by this process." It is by virtue of the Atonement that we have *this process*, which means the powerful influences of the Holy Spirit, accompanying all measures of correction and chastisement.

J. B.

Canonbury, 11th January, 1890.

CRITIQUE ON A SENTENCE IN A VALUABLE SERMON.

SIR,—You have a valuable sermon, preached by the Archdeacon of Liverpool, on October 13th, 1889.

I quote a sentence in full: "Every man is responsible for his faith, for." One expects that what follows would prove his responsibility. But it does not, for it throws the responsibility on the weight of the evidence given in proof, so that the sentence really should run thus: "No man is responsible for his faith, for a man's faith depends on the evidence given in proof." But let me give the rest of the sentence: "And the weight of evidence depends on"—what do your readers think?—"on the degree of attention and candour with which it is considered." Let me apply the whole sentence to a proposition of Euclid. "Every man is responsible for his faith in this purpose, for his faith depends, not on anything in himself, but upon the demonstration." This is bad enough. But what follows is worse again. "And the strength of the proof depends," not on its logic, "but on the degree of attention and candour with which it is considered." Every man is responsible for his faith, for it depends on what he has no control over; and the weight of evidence depends on the varying attention and candour of the several pupils. Anything more illogical I never read. This I say with all respect for the venerable preacher. But even Homer and Hooker nod at times.

C.C., V.-G.

THE Rev. John Watkiss Jones, curate of Caverswall, who has been presented by the Bishop of Lichfield to

the vicarage of St. James's, West Bromwich, formerly belonged to the Wesleyan body, and was Gospeller at his ordination in Lichfield in 1885.

THE Dean of Winchester and Mrs. Kitchin left the Deanery on Tuesday last for a two months' visit to Switzerland. It is sincerely hoped that the change of air and scene will completely restore Mrs. Kitchin's health, which has given anxiety to her family and friends for some time past.

THE Bishop of Melanesia sailed on Thursday last in the *Pekin* for Cairo, where he proposes to stay three weeks, and then to go on by the *Rome* to Australia and Norfolk Island. He first intended to leave by the *Shannon* on the 26th December, but was laid up by the prevailing epidemic, which found out his old malarial fever. The news from Melanesia is generally very good, but the clergy have suffered a great deal this year from fever and illness. One, at least, will have to resign. A new clergyman left by the *Shannon* to join the Mission, but one, if not two, more are needed.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that a remarkable complication has arisen over the vicarage of Northop, near Chester, in the diocese of St. Asaph. "The Rev. D. Edwards, the present vicar, has been promoted to Bala. Northop, which is one of the richest livings in the diocese, was then offered to the Rev. Thomas Richardson, vicar of Rhyl, who accepted it. The vicarage of Rhyl was then offered to and accepted by Canon Howell Evans, vicar of Potton, Beds, and formerly of Oswestry. The vicar of Rhyl now declines to accept Northop, and the Rev. Bulkeley Jones, warden of Ruthin, to whom it has since been offered, has also declined." It is now stated that the vicarage of Northop has been accepted by the Rev. J. Parry Morgan, vicar of Llanrhaiadr, Denbigh, and that Canon Howell Evans will enter on his duties at Rhyl in Easter week.

AT a meeting of the Standing Committee of the York Diocesan Conference, held in Archbishop Zouche's Chapel, York Minster, under the presidency of the Archbishop of York, the following resolutions were unanimously agreed to :—

The President consults the Standing Committee upon all three points comprehended in the following resolutions, and the Standing Committee and the President agree as follows :—

"1. That it is not desirable to hold a diocesan conference for the usual business in 1890, the year when the Church Congress meets in Hull."

"2. The committee recommend that there should be no conference in 1890, and a conference in 1891, and another in 1892."

"3. That the election of elective members be held, according to the rules, in 1890, and that the hon. secretary (Canon Rowsell, M.A., St. Paul's Vicarage, Hull) be empowered to take all necessary steps for the election."

The elections will take place in the spring of the present year.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. Harry P., M.A., Vicar of Kirby-Grindalyth, York.
Bingham, Rev. W. P. S., M.A., Vicar of Kenton, Exeter.
Bower, Rev. R., M.A., Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle ; Chaplain to the Bishop of Carlisle.
Cann, Rev. J. P., Rector of Dunterton, Devonshire.
Cronshaw, Rev. Christopher, Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Westhoughton, Bolton.
Danks, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Ilkley ; Rector of Richmond, Yorkshire.
Eastman, Rev. George, B.D., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Rochester.
Eddis, Rev. J. E., Vicar of Paul's, Truro.
Foweraker, Rev. E. T., Chaplain of Exeter Asylum.
Garstin, Rev. Anthony, Curate-in-Charge of Ropsley, Lincolnshire ; Rector of Redmile, near Bottesford.
Heard, Rev. W. A., M.A., Head Master of Fettes College, Edinburgh.
Jones, Rev. Frank Emlyn, M.A., late Curate of Bromsgrove ; Vicar of St. Mark's, Low Moor, Bradford.
Mackreth, Rev. E. F., M.A., Vicar of All Souls', Brighton.
Mahomed, Rev. J. D. K., M.A., Curate of St. Ann's, Highgate ; Chaplain of the London Hospital.
Marsh-Dunn, Rev. R. M., Curate of St. Michael's, East Teignmouth ; Vicar of St. Nicholas (or Shaldon), Devonshire.
Matthews, Rev. John E., M.A., Vicar of Swanwick, near Alfreton ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Derby.
Morgan, Rev. John, Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Morgan, Rev. W. Moore, LL.D., Head Master of Royal, School, Armagh ; Prebendary of Mullabrack in Armagh Cathedral, and Keeper of the Armagh Library.
Pierson, Rev. Kirshaw Thomson, M.A., Rector of Little Fransham, Norfolk.
Prance, Rev. Clement Howard, M.A., Vicar of Annesley, near Mansfield ; Vicar of St. John's, Derby.
Price-Williams, Rev. Morris, M.A., Rector of Rotherfield, Peppard, Oxon.
Ratcliffe, Rev. Charles Edward Stuart, M.A., Curate of Old Charlton ; Vicar of Bickenhill, Birmingham.
Savery, Rev. J. M., Private Chaplain to Mr. H. G. Murray Stewart, Cally, Gatehouse, N.B.
Seymour, Rev. Albert Eden, M.A., Archdeacon of Barnstaple.
Smith, Rev. Edward Paske, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
Smith, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Great and Vicar of Little Hormead, Buntingford.
Stevens, Rev. S. W., Chaplain to the Royal South Hants Infirmary ; Rector of Burley, Ringwood.
Thornton, Rev. Frederick Ferdinand Marten Schleicher, Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Northampton ; Missioner and Public Preacher in the Diocese of Ely and Honorary Canon in Ely Cathedral.
Vincent, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Were, Right Rev. Dr., Bishop-Suffragan of Derby ; Rural Dean of Derby.
Wright, Rev. Benjamin, M.A., Rector of Sandon, Essex.
Young, Rev. Philip, Curate of All Saints', Stamford ; Dean and Rector of Christ Church Cathedral, Nassau.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Burgess, Rev. Robert Burdett, M.A., for thirty-three years Rector of Chickney, at Newport, Essex, on the 9th inst., aged 84.
Burroughes, Rev. Robert, at Pencombe Rectory, Herefordshire, on the 9th inst.
Bushby, Rev. Frederick Ewan, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. Peter's College, at the University Arms Hotel, Cambridge, on the 5th inst., aged 94.
Ewing, Rev. Alexander, Vicar of St Peter's, Islington, at 50, Milner-square, N., on the 10th inst.
Gairdner, Rev. Carter Alexander, A.M., at the Rectory, Clonard Hill of Down, co. Meath, on the 1st inst., aged 56.
Greville, Rev. Eden S., formerly Vicar of St. Paul's, Clapham, and for many years Rector of Bonsall, Derbyshire, at the Chestnuts, Clapham, on the 12th inst., aged 86.
Hulme, Rev. William, M.A., J.P., Rector of the parish, at Brampton Abbots, Herefordshire, on the 4th inst., aged 72.
Lees, Rev. William, late Vicar of Norley, and formerly Incumbent of St. Peter's, Oldham, at Frodsham, on the 1st inst., aged 83.
Littledale, Rev. Richard Frederick, LL.D., D.C.L., at 9, Red Lion Square, on the 11th inst., aged 56.
Mylius, Rev. Frederick Henry, LL.B., late of the 15th and 17th Regiments, for twenty-six years Rector of Elmdon, at Elmdon Rectory, on the 8th inst., aged 61.
Savigny, Rev. Wm. Henry, M.A., formerly of Bromsgrove, at Launceston, Tasmania, on August 5, aged 64.

The Church of England Pulpit.

A GREAT SCHOLAR AND MODEL BISHOP.

By the Rev. Canon WESTCOTT, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

Sermon Preached in Memory of the Late Bishop of Durham, in Westminster Abbey, on Sunday, December 29th, 1889.

"They go from strength to strength. Every one of them appeareth before God in Zion."—Psalm lxxxiv. 7.

WE have all pondered at some quiet time this psalm of human pilgrimage and divine fellowship, of human aspiration and divine fulfilment; this psalm, in which the solitary exile confesses that his soul can find satisfaction only in worship, his feeling and his sense only in the recognition of a living God; this psalm, in which he acknowledges with a tenderness taught by sorrow that his King and his God offers the shelter of His altar to the humblest creature He has made. We have all felt, in the course of the chequered years, something of the bitterness of unsatisfied desire, something of the desolateness of the way by which we must travel, something of the fruitlessness of the labour on which we have spent our force. And there are those in every age to whom God, in His great love, makes known the transforming power of His presence, who look to Him and find every longing the sign of a new joy, every lonely place a gate of heaven thronged with messengers of mercy, every disappointment that appointed season of darkness which is the prelude to the harvest. "They go from strength to strength. Every one of them appeareth before God in Zion." For such the vision of God is a source of energy and the goal of effort. The life of man is, indeed, in the phrase of an early father, "the vision of God." *Vita hominis visio Dei.* And yet this is not the fulness of the truth. The life of man is that he stands before God and bears the light of that ineffable glory. It is not that he sees God with faculties feeble and intermittent, but that he appears before God, that he feels that God sees him, sustaining and purifying all on which His eye rests with a compassion which is unchangeable. Thus the exact phrase fixes our confidence on that which cannot fail. Our own vision of God is a reflection, often clouded and never complete, of God's vision of us which is perfect and uninterrupted, not so much knowing Him as known to Him, not so much seeing as seen. We have the assurance that our loftiest thoughts answer to His inspiration, and our largest hopes to His counsel. We have all, I say, often pondered these things. We have often called up before our minds the image of a life moving through every variety of circumstance, through achievements and delays, through discipline and sorrow, with one unbroken tenour of fruitful service, and then shown at last as being what it ever has been—a life fulfilled in the face of God. So the words of the psalmist will always have many applications, fertile in lessons of hope and encouragement. Here and to-day they are to me the record of a life which has been a great part of my own life—the simple experience of a friendship for forty years, a friendship which at this most solemn time does not seem so much to have been interrupted as to have been consecrated for ever more. "They go from strength to strength. Every one of them appeareth before God in Zion."

Ten years ago, when it was my duty to commend the Bishop of Durham to the prayers of this congregation in view of the charge which was then entrusted to him, I used the first clause to express what I knew and what I hoped—what I knew of his work as a scholar, and what I hoped for his work as a bishop; and now I venture to use the whole verse as the fitting summary of a life completed in the Lord—a life, I say, completed in the Lord. With the deepest sense of personal bereavement I must hold that the life on which we look is a true whole. I cannot speak of it as incomplete. It is true that we confidently looked for fresh treasures of scholarship to be brought out of his accumulated stores, for more proofs of that just and vigorous administration by which, as one said to me who could speak with authority, he had made the diocese of one heart, for more counsels of calm and sober judgment in seasons of perplexity; but all these would have only been illustrations of the nature which we knew already. The type was fixed and recognised and welcomed; and a noble character is more than noble works. It is an inexhaustible source of life like itself. Productiveness is measured by power of quickening, and never have I felt before as I feel now the vitality of all true work, the certainty that all true work is in one sense complete.

What, then, you may ask me, is the secret of the life of him to whom we look this afternoon with reverent regards? It is, in a word, the secret of strength. He was strong by singleness of aim, by resolution, by judgment, by enthusiasm, by sympathy, by devotion. In old days it was strength to be with him, and for the future it will be strength to recall him. He was strong by singleness of aim. No thought of self ever mingled with his most laborious or his most brilliant efforts. He neither sought nor avoided fame or emolument or honour. He was sent by his Master's commission to bear witness to the truth. If the truth were imperilled, he put forth all his powers to guard it. If the truth were established, his end was reached. In

that spirit I know better than any one how he could claim for others that which was his own by right, and rejoice if they obtained successes which he could easily have made his own. In all things he gladly submitted himself to what he called "the exacting tyranny of an unselfish love." If he rejoiced, and he did rejoice, in Auckland and in Durham, it was that he might be vividly reminded of the responsibilities which were attached to his inheritance, and feel in their salutary discipline the blessing of great cares. He gratefully acknowledged his debt to the past, and he wished to write the acknowledgment on his own gifts. The most striking feature in St. Ignatius's at Sunderland, his thank-offering for the work of ten years, bears witness to the feeling. The banded quatrefoil piers of the arcade were made at his request after the pattern of those at Auckland, that they might mark for ever the origin of the daughter church. He was strong by resolution. His care and calmness in forming a decision were matched by his inflexibility when it was once formed. "You cannot tell," he said to me as we walked together in the gardens of Trinity on the last evening of his University life, "You cannot tell what it costs me to break up the home of thirty years, and abandon what I thought would be the work of my lifetime." I did, indeed, know something of the agony of those four days in which he sought to learn his duty. I could not altogether miss the meaning of the tone in which he said at last to me, with trembling lips: "I have decided; I go to Durham." But when the choice was once made, from that time forward Cambridge was nobly forgotten. There was not one look backward, not one word of regret. He was strong by that sobriety of judgment which commands the old, and that fire of enthusiasm which wins the young. Speculation had comparatively little interest for him. Nothing visionary, nothing that men call "mystical," marred the effect of his masculine reasoning. He knew perfectly well how to be silent, and how to plead his cause with keen and persistent eagerness. As long as he was free, he spoke, not because he had an opportunity of speaking, or because he was expected to speak, but because he had a message to deliver; and then he pressed his conviction with a passionate eloquence which has hardly yet been duly recognised. His learning was always an instrument and not an end. No investigation of details ever diverted his attention from the main issue. He mastered two outlying languages, Armenian and Coptic, in order to deal more securely with the secondary materials of the Ignatian controversy; but no ordinary reader would know the fact. For him the interpretation of ancient text was a study in life. Books were a witness of something far greater, through which alone they could be understood. A Greek play, or a fragmentary inscription, or a letter of Basil, or a homily of Chrysostom, was to him a revelation of men stirred by like passions with ourselves, intelligible only through a vital apprehension of the circumstances under which they were written. He was a born historian. "How I long," he said to me more than once—"How I long to write a history of the fourth century!" If he has not written it he has shown how it must be written. So it was that he found the Holy Scriptures to be, as he was never weary of proclaiming, living oracles, the utterance of the Spirit through living men, articulate with a human voice. So it was that he delighted to mark the contrast in St. Paul's words and acts, that he might realise and convey to others the conception of a teacher striving, even as we may strive, in our measure, to overcome ignorance and prejudice by the versatile powers of an unlimited love. He was strong by breadth of sympathy. Sympathy is, indeed the necessary offspring of the historic spirit. No man can study the Bible, no man can study the New Testament, with open eyes, and fail to see how the one truth receives homage now in this form and now in that; how it transcends the contents of every human system; how the fact of the incarnation requires for its complete expression, the ministry of all men of all ages; how it gives to all believers an inspiration of unity, and teaches that uniformity is impossible. Twice, on representative occasions, as some among us may remember, he enforced this principle of Christian sympathy with characteristic vigour, and laid down firmly its essential limitations. Once when speaking to undergraduates at Cambridge on the enormous power which lay latent in the heart of each, even the weakest, he gave for their motto, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's," and charged them with burning words, as the heirs of eighteen Christian centuries, to use every gift as servants of our sovereign Lord. "Ignatius the martyr," he said, "is yours, and Athanasius and Francis of Assisi, and Luther, and Xavier, and Wesley, because you and they are Christ's. The immemorial annals of life are yours, and yours too all the results of physical analysis and construction, because you and these are Christ's—Christ's, whom God appointed heir of all things, even as He made all things through Him." And then again, when he offered, in his loved St. Paul's, counsel to the friend of his youth for the organisation of a new diocese under unique conditions, he summed up all in the application of the apostolic phrase, "I am made all things to all men that I might by all means gain some." "You, too," he said, "you will strive to become all things to all men—to the miners as a miner, to the Cornishmen as a Cornishman, to the Wesleyans as a Wesleyan, though you are a Churchman, that you may bring all together in Christ. Yes, the law of our Christian accommodation is the paramount duty of winning followers, not for ourselves, not for our party, but for our Master. The condition under which our bound-

less wealth may become a blessing to us is the unceasing sense that we are not our own, but bought by His blood. In other words, all real sympathy rests on a spiritual basis. All lasting co-operation is a service to a common Lord."

So he taught and so he laboured at Cambridge and at Durham and at Lambeth. As he loved his University, he was among the first to make its resources and its spirit minister to the higher education of the whole country. As he loved his college he sought untiringly to use his power for the re-invigoration of the larger life of the University. He drew from his unsurpassed knowledge of the early growth of Christianity an answer to the charge of inadequate results brought against modern missions. He gave wise counsel and encouragement to the novel efforts of the Church Army. The causes of co-operation and temperance found in him a courageous advocate. The cause of purity is identified with his name. The seventy sons whom he has left in the diocese, trained for their ministry under his roof, will never forget that he charged them to claim for Christ every interest of life; and the respectable crowds of pitmen and artisans, the closed shops and drawn blinds of colliery villages through which he was borne two days ago to his chosen resting place, showed that the charge had not been in vain. In all these ways he was strong. But the last secret of his strength, as it must be of our strength, was his devotion to a living God, as he worked from hour to hour face to face with the glory of the eternal Father shining full from the person of Christ. The Christ whom he preached was neither an abstraction of theology, nor a Christ after the flesh, but the Creator, Redeemer, Fulfiller, present by the Spirit sent in His name in the individual soul, and in humanity, and in the universe, bearing all things by the word of His power to their appointed end. He knew—and he lived, and thought, and wrote as knowing—that the incarnation is not a fact only of one point of time, but an eternal truth through which all experience and all nature, laid bare to their sternest realities, will be seen to be in time a present message from Him in whom we live and move and have our being. And we may well be thankful to know that the last words on which he looked with failing sense were the expression of his own faith through the lips of St. Paul: "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor heights, nor depths, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

Brethren, however imperfectly the portraiture may have been sketched, yet we can all feel that it is the portraiture of a true man, of a true Churchman, of a true father in God, of one who felt that no prescription can absolve us from the duty of meeting fearlessly some of the unheeded facts and wresting a blessing from them; who felt that the confession of Christianity belongs to the ideal of a nation, who felt that our own communion is not of to-day or yesterday, but in its essence the bequest of the Apostles, and in its form the outcome of our English character and our English history. Does it not stir and encourage and inspire us, does it not chasten and restrain us, and bid us learn from the past the true measure of our own controversies and trials, and feel that we, too, are living in the presence and by the power of the ascended Christ? There is on all sides, we know, a strange and demoralising uneasiness. We do not dare to look boldly on the dark places about us, and they become fertile in appalling phantoms. "There is," a shrewd observer said sadly to me, "there is just a faint suspicion of uncertainty in most of the professions of belief which are made publicly." Is it, then, nothing to hear, as it were, from the grave the voice of one whom none ever dared to accuse of incompetence or inadequate knowledge, or to suspect of holding a brief with hireling skill for a cause to which he had not committed his own soul? "I believe from my heart that the truth which this Gospel of St. John more especially enshrines—the truth that Jesus Christ is the very Incarnate Word, the manifestation of the Father to mankind—is the one lesson which, duly apprehended, will do more than all our feeble efforts to purify and elevate human life." There is, again, a perilous and half-unconscious wilfulness among us. We have lost by our insularity the instinct of the spirit of obedience. We are proud of our independence, and we grow hastily confident, perhaps only through the confidence of others. We are convinced, as we think, in our own mind, and we will not allow that what we honestly believe shall be called in question. Is it, then, nothing to hear from one who spoke with a ruler's responsibility of the hopes and dangers of our Church: "Her mission is unique. Her capabilities and opportunities are magnificent. She is intermediate, and she may be mediatorial when the opportunity arrives. Shall we spoil this potentiality, shall we stultify this career, shall we mar this destiny by impatience, by self-will, by party spirit, by misguided and headstrong zeal, by harsh words embittering strife, by any narrowness of temper, or of aim, or of view, by a lawless assertion of self-will which obtrudes its own fancies at all hazards, by a reluctance to welcome zeal in others when overlaid by extravagance, by a too great importunity in urging at unseasonable moments reforms which are wise and salutary in themselves, by a too great stiffness in refusing to contemplate the necessity of any reform?" "A grave responsibility," he continues —"no graver can well be conceived—rests upon us all. Never were our hopes brighter; never were our anxieties keener. Never was there greater need of that divine charity which beareth all things, believeth all things. Happy they who so feel and so act, for theirs is the crown of crowns." He did

so feel, so act, and, as we trust, he has that crown of crowns.

There is, once more, a pessimism among many thoughtful men, born of intellectual isolation. We see little, and it seems to be sad. We mistake minuteness of knowledge for breadth of view. The record of a day or of a year may show good rare and evil rife. The creature of an hour might prove conclusively to his fellows that the setting of the sun would bring in the end of life. Is it, then, nothing to hear an utterance which comes back to us now, after two months, with unspeakable solemnity? "It was the strain both in London and at home in connection with the Pan-Anglican gathering which broke me down hopelessly. I did not regret it then, and I do not regret it now. I should not have wished to recall the past even if my illness had been fatal, for what, after all, is the individual life in the history of the Church? Men may come and men may go, but the broad, mighty, rolling stream of the Church itself—the cleansing, purifying, fertilising tide of the river of God—flows on for ever and ever."

I said that I could not admit that the life towards which we have looked—a life which may be summed up in three clauses, "from strength to strength," "from weakness to strength," "from strength to the rest of God"—can be rightly called incomplete. I will dare to add that it will be through our own want of faith if that which is our personal sorrow becomes a loss to the great cause which it is our joy to serve. The departed are for us, at length, all they aspired to be. Life passes off from them still fuller and purer than before. They rule the living, not only with a physical necessity, but by a spiritual influence. They speak with a changeless authority. Their voice—the voice which we have just heard—comes directly to the soul. Once before, within our own recollection, a voice from a deathbed was made to us a message of peace. God grant in His great mercy that this voice from the tomb may be filled with no less virtue to stay our divisions. Then shall we feel why we are taught in our Communion Office to bless God's Holy Name for all His servants departed this life in His faith and fear—to bless Him not with a pious complacency which costs us nothing, but with a strenuous endeavour to follow the example which they have given and we have studied. So, brethren, let us all now beseech God, with the intense supplication as of one man in Christ Jesus, that He will give us grace to learn, each in our appointed office, the lessons of His servant's accepted service; grace to feel the infinite vastness of the truth which is given to us, not to supply materials for speculation, but strength for the accomplishment of duty; grace to take earnest heed lest, through any impatience, or irreverence, or carelessness on our part, some weak brother may be tempted to unreflecting dogmatism, or superstition, or pride; grace to strive untiringly to understand others and make ourselves understood, knowing that there is room among us for every variety of loyal zeal: grace to review with thankful and true hearts the grandeur of our inheritance, and the reaching issues of our short stewardship; grace to bring our gifts of reason and knowledge, of character and place, our opinions and our arguments, silent and prostrate before the presence of God, and to take back, for open use only, that which has borne the purifying light of the eternal; grace to recognise, as the law of our several lives, "From God; in the face of God; unto God." What strength, what patience, what self-control, what humility, what hope, what cleansing of every spiritual sense will then follow for the healing of our manifold distresses! It is told that, when Bishop Butler drew near to his end, he asked his chaplain if he also heard the music which filled his own being. The music was not unreal because the untrained ear could not catch its harmonies; and it may be that if our whole being is henceforward set heavenwards, we shall hear, when we are crossing waste places, as it seems, in loneliness and sorrow, and inward conflict, the great hosts by whom we are encompassed taking up our human song, and saying in our souls: "They go from strength to strength. Every one of them appeareth before God in Zion."

THE PEACE OF GOD.

By the Rev. Canon Duckworth, D.D., Canon of Westminster, and Vicar of St. Mark's, Hamilton Terrace, N.W.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, December 22nd, 1889.

"And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."—Philippians iv. 7.

It is significant, brethren, that the Epistle for this last Sunday in Advent is taken from that letter of St. Paul which, above all others, overflows with hopefulness and joy. We are not directed to-day to those graver thoughts which are inseparable from expectation of our Lord's return. The great watchword, the familiar greeting of Apostolic days, "The Lord is at hand," sounds indeed in our ears, but not as a warning of judgment, not as a reminder of the account which we must give. It seems to have only joyful associations to-day; it seems to be toned by anticipation of Christmas gladness. It tells us of a presence in which all anxieties shall be done away, all cares lifted at last from hearts that are weary and heavy-laden here. "The Lord is at hand; be careful for nothing." Relief is on its way; the redressing of all wrongs, the solution of all enigmas, is nigh; these harassing troubles, these distressing doubts and fears shall

have an end. Meanwhile, carry them all to the throne of grace. Always "by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God," and then you shall reap the fruit of this twofold mood of prayerful expectation and gratitude, the peace of God which passeth all understanding through Christ Jesus."

The Church, as you know, has turned this great promise into a prayer, and embodied the words of it in that benediction which you and I know so well. All through the Christian centuries that beautiful invocation of peace, enshrined in the liturgy of the Church, has been heard. It closes our highest act of worship, that which sets forth the dying love of Him who is our peace, and it is the familiar end of the service of our Lord's Day:

> We stand to bless Thee, e'er our worship cease,
> Then, lowly kneeling, wait Thy word of peace.

But, familiar as the benediction is, do we realise its meaning? Do we, indeed, know what the peace of God is, and how it passes all understanding? Do we know what it is to have that peace keeping, or rather, as St. Paul's word signifies, "mounting guard" over our hearts and minds? Is not the blessing apt to be for many of us little more than a soothing formula of dismissal, which, if we attend to it at all, gives us a vague sense of repose and security, but passes no further into personal experience? It is surely well that we should try to understand it, and should find in our lives an ever-increasing fulfilment of the promise which it contains.

What, then, let us ask, is the peace of God? St. Paul was certainly using no vague phrase when he spoke of such a peace. It stood for something which he knew well. He had made trial of its power to guard, and he knew also how true it is that it passes all understanding, that it lies deeper far than any act of the intellect can go in quest of it, that though it can be profoundly felt and enjoyed, it cannot be analysed. Can we doubt that for him, no less than for those colleagues of his to whom the request was directly made, the peace of God was the peace of Christ, the peace which He solemnly made over and bequeathed to His chosen ones on the eve of His passion? Here was the precious legacy which was to pass on in an unending reversion to all believers. It came from the upper room; it was the perpetuation of the calm that reigned in the heart of Christ on that never-to-be-forgotten night, when with the shame and anguish of the cross full in view, and that worse anguish of the great conflict in the garden close at hand, He had said: "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you." "Not as the world giveth." The hollowness of all substitutes for the peace of God would seem to have been in the mind of St. Paul when he dictated the text, for the original of the words, "which passeth all understanding," may be rendered, "which surpasses every device or counsel." And it is thus that the words are translated by Bishop Lightfoot, the great scholar and theologian, whose death yesterday deprived the Church of England of one of the nolest of her sons and one of the most distinguished of her prelates. The peace which God gives, St. Paul implies, is a peace which, coming as it does from Christ, the world cannot give. It excels every contrivance of man; all attempts to procure peace apart from Him are unsatisfying and vain. The rendering of our Authorised Version is, of course, absolutely admissible and correct, and it may be that the Apostle is describing the peace of God as a thing which defies comprehension; but you notice that he brings in our Lord; he says that the promised peace shall guard our hearts and minds "through Christ Jesus." It is more than likely that he is thinking of the peace that flows from Him in its infinite superiority to all other, pointing his converts of Philippi to the guarding power of that peace, the counterfeits of which are for ever appealing to men's hearts and minds. One such counterfeit some of those Philippians must have known well. While our Lord was on earth, and for generations after, the noblest spirits of the Pagan world were sustaining a philosophy the sole aim of which was to do what He undertook to do, namely, to make man independent in the depth of his being of the changes and chances of this world. At the time St. Paul was carrying the good news of God through the Roman Empire a teacher was living who left behind him an illustrious name. He was even then reaching the zenith of his fame, and he had an offer to make which was strangely like that of Jesus Christ. He said to his disciples: "Not as the world giveth, give I unto you." I am referring to Seneca, who in some of his doctrines approaches so near to Christianity that one of the early fathers claims him almost as a Christian. He taught himself and he taught others to aspire to a philosophy calm, staid, moral, unwavering, a stern apathy, proof against every joy and sorrow of public and private life, and which not even the spectacle of moral evil was to be permitted to ruffle. And a far nobler stoic at a later day, the great Emperor whose meditations may be called the holiest book in Pagan literature, has left us the most pathetic record of his own struggles to attain the peace which the world cannot give, and to attain it by sheer faith in the beauty and self-sufficiency of human virtue. And let me remind you, brethren, of another famous and well-tried device, older far than stoicism, and not, like it, an extinct philosophy, but at this hour the creed of a vast proportion of the human race. Buddhism is a religion which has for its proposed goal and consummation a peace which the world cannot give. The haven to which it points its votaries, after training them through this life by gradual extirpation of all desire, is deliverance into

an undimmed repose — a repose which we cannot distinguish from annihilation, which involves the destruction of personality, the utter and final loss of self-consciousness. Regarding human life as only vanity, delusion, misery, it teaches that the desires which make us cling to life are a curse from which we must struggle to be set free. Kill desire, extinguish feeling, quell every throb of passion and emotion within the breast, cease to care for happiness; let not one pulsation, straining, longing, remain to ruffle the spirit and then the "life" will be yours, then here on earth you will be numbered among the enlightened and the free; the shadows which men are mistaking for reality will no longer baffle you, the degrading bonds which bind them will bind you no more, and death, when it comes, instead of being, as it must be for the unemancipated, only the entrance on a new scene of sorrow, will be but the final rush of darkness on a spirit that has for ever ceased to be. Such is the strange doctrine which forms the fundamental principles of the Buddhist faith. And, brethren, does not the prolonged and mighty hold of such a doctrine on a vast portion of mankind bear touching witness to the deep need of the human heart to which Christ came on earth to minister? There is something profoundly pathetic in this struggle of the human spirit after liberation from the things of sense. Yes, in that morbid suppression of all passion and desire, that impossible extinction of every natural impulse, we may discern the groping of the human spirit after something higher. Those who seemed to themselves to be only seeking to escape from a world that was only unreal and a life that was nothing but vanity, were unconsciously seeking for the "peace of God, which passeth all understanding"; they were seeking, though they knew it not, after participation in that infinite life which is and abideth for ever.

Do we know what the peace of God is in contrast with this and all other devices evolved by man? First, then, its superiority consists in *its universality*. It is a peace offered to all and obtainable by all. The peace of Stoicism was assuredly not for all. It was the perquisite of the philosophic few; it was for those rare spirits who could perceive and pursue a high ideal, who could conquer all weakness and rise to self-mastery. It was hopelessly out of the reach of the multitude; it was impossible to ordinary souls; it had no power to lift them above the temptations of sense or to shield them from the arrows of fortune. And so, too, noble as it is in idea, Buddhism proves in practice the most inoperative of faiths. Enjoyable to the rich and the noble and to the ascetic and recluse who may make it the one business of their days, it has no power to raise the many out of their degradation. Its teaching seems but one long scornful wail over the vanity of this world and the misery of human existence, and it leaves men without a hope and without God to face the sorrows and struggles which, unless interpreted by the thought of His love, are a mystery too cruel, a burden too heavy for our poor hearts to bear.

But, again, the peace of God surpasses all other for this reason—that it has in it a Divine element, it springs out of the living spirit of *the love of duty*. It is that which Christ spoke of as His peace, the natural reflection of an entire surrender to the will of God. His peace was perfect because His obedience was unmarred, it was fed every moment by a trust which never faltered. The Gospel invites us to this peace, which comes of sure faith in a presiding love, and of the sacrifice of our human wills to the holy will of the Father in heaven. Well do I remember, brethren, endeavouring to convey to a devout Buddhist priest in the island of Ceylon the full meaning of this our Christian ideal, and to set it in contrast with that after which he was aspiring. He had said to me that the cardinal defect of Christianity in his eyes was this, that it made no provision for the extinction of desire, and therefore that it could have no true peace to offer to man. I pointed out that the initial act of the spiritual life implies the renouncing of every wish and desire, and every movement of the will that belongs to the man's individual self, or that points merely to his own interest and pleasure; and that the whole subsequent course of that life, as laid out for us by our Divine Master, was simply a more and more complete extinction of that narrow isolated life that centres in self; a nearer and nearer approach to that state in which every emotion of the mind, and every pulsation of the spiritual being, shall be in absolute harmony with the infinite mind and will, and apart from the life of God we shall have no life that we can call our own. "When you speak of the will of God and the life of God," was his reply, "you speak of that which has no meaning for us, for we do not believe in a God." The Christian life described by St. Paul when he said, "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me," was utterly unintelligible to the man who knew not the Father; it was not life, but escape from life that he had learned to look upon as the chief good of man. It was vain to tell him of One who came to tell that we might have life, and have it more abundantly; vain to dwell on the deep repose of heart shed abroad by God Himself, and the conviction of His unchanging love. But this, brethren, is what breathes into the soul a restful life beyond all other life; this is the only guarantee of the peace which the world cannot take away; this is what breathes no mystic, artificial calm. It involves no false ignoring of the facts of our earthly lot, but imparts to all who experience it a felt consolation and realised strength and a faith which never maketh ashamed. And it is a gift which we can only derive from the very heart and life of Christ Himself — God made manifest in the flesh. Only when we abide in

Him, and He abides in us, is the soul established and settled upon a foundation which cannot be removed, but standeth fast for ever.

The peace of God! Is it, indeed, mounting guard over our hearts and minds? Very soon we shall be hearing again the angelic anthem which heralded its arrival, "Peace on earth; good-will towards men." Our Christmas joy derives all its warmth from the good news that life and peace are made ours through Him, who as at this time came with the revelation of the Father's love. Ask yourselves if His Divine legacy has become yours? Do you know anything of His peace? Are you no stranger to that Christ-like serenity of heart which doubts cannot long disturb, and on which the gravest cares of this bewildering world sit lightly? We may not, indeed, keep up the unwavering flame of the perfect love which has cast out fear; but we may through Christ attain the composure which comes from a happy trust in a love which knows no change and is stronger than death. Through Him we can rise day by day above the worries that fret us — the seductions which assail us here. He, if only we will give ourselves to Him, can enable us in heart and mind to ascend into the zone of that deep tranquillity which, like an atmosphere above the range of storm, encircles evermore the throne of God.

It may safely be said that the principal measure of a man's moral state and value is to be found in the kind of peace on which he has set his heart; for the pursuit of peace is universal. Christ knew that He was addressing Himself to a universal longing of the human heart when He said: "Come unto Me, and I will give you rest." Rest and peace in some form we are all of us seeking; and Christ saw that the secret of our misery is the infatuated endeavour to find rest in the things which can never give it. What were all these cautions of His against the world—these repeated assertions of the impossibility of combining the love of the world with the love of God? They show us clearly how well He understood our worst danger, how well He knew that, left to ourselves, we spend our money for that which is not bread and our labour for that which satisfies not. He has drawn for us to the life the picture of a man who covets the most obvious and vulgar peace which the world gives — the peace of prosperity and external ease. He fences him round with every comfort and indulgence, and lays to his soul the flattering unction that there shall no harm happen unto him. He says to his soul, "Thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease; eat, drink, and be merry." The world, assuredly, has its promise of peace for those who will serve it well. He who is bent on finding his portion in this life may find it in many forms, and be long ere he discovers the hollowness of his possession. For, brethren, remember, the world makes its appeal not only to the sensual and the ease-loving, it offers peace not only to the fool, but to the cultured and the thoughtful; it has its lure for every taste and craving, gross and refined, its prize for every phase of ambition. To the diligent it holds out the fruits of industry; for the careful it heaps up wealth; to the student it promises the knowledge which is power; to the bold and adventurous it offers the delight of fame and respect and wide influence. It is foolish to speak contemptuously of these things—worse than foolish to denounce them as essentially and inherently evil. The pursuit of these higher forms of peace which the world offers is a legitimate pursuit; God does not frown on it, Christ does not forbid it; nay, the progress and welfare of society are seen to be bound up in it. But what God bids us believe is that these pursuits can never satisfy the immortal part of our nature. "Thou hast made us for Thyself," cried St. Augustine in his well-known ejaculation, "and our hearts cannot know repose until they rest in Thee."

Yes, there is that within each one of us to which the purest repose attainable through earthly things cannot minister. There are depths, even in the shallowest heart and mind, which no mere outward gift can reach; there are times when we are made acutely conscious of the inadequacy and insecurity of all earthly satisfaction; and this consciousness of imperfection in the best that the world can give is intended to point us onward to our true rest. Not in mockery, but in love, does God awake us to it. If the glory of the gift vanishes, as it does so often, in the very moment of realisation; if again and again in our eager pursuit of happiness we are disappointed and undeceived, it is that our hearts may turn to Him with whom alone true joys are to be found. It has been well said, that one of the first lessons to be learned in the spiritual life is this—that the possessions that are most worthy to be dear to us are yet dear to us under their present form, not for what they are so much as for what they mean, for what they suggest and express to us of a Father's love. And so the peace of God is as necessary to any safe and real enjoyment of our earthly blessings in the day of their intensest and fullest bestowal, as it is necessary for our consolation in the dark day when we must part with them all.

At a pension held on Saturday the Rev. J. H. Lupton, Sur-Master of St. Paul's School, Hulsean Lecturer in 1887, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, was elected to the preachership of the Honourable Society of Gray's-inn.

To the Deaf.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 25, 1890.

THE WORK OF GOD AND MAN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.

THE work of God and the work of man are each essential in the building up of the Christian character. God has a part to do and man a part. Forgiveness is an element in the formation of a Christian character—forgiveness of the sins of the past. But can man forgive his own sins? Forgiveness is of God. Repentance is the correlative of forgiveness. Repentance is an element in the formation of a noble character—repentance for the sins and errors of the past. But does God repent? Repentance is of the sinner. Forgiveness on God's part, and repentance on man's part: these are the correlative elements coming together in the formation of character.

Grace is also an element in this development. And what is grace? Not man's favour and acceptance of himself, but God's favour and acceptance of ill-deserving man. The means of grace are also an element in the formation of noble character. The means of grace are apprehended by man. Grace and the means of grace are also correlatives in the formation of character. Both must be employed. Grace is received by us through the means of grace, and the means of grace help us to Grace.

The choice of man by God seems to be an element in character building. Who thus elects, God or man? God. Who determines who shall be elected? Man. Man determines whether he shall be or shall not be elected. Man's determination and God's choice act conjointly in character-building.

So, also, growth or development is a quality inherent in character. But through what means is this growth? Growth depends at once on life and on food. Without life, food were useless; without food, life were at an end. From whom come life and food? The life is of God, His absolute gift. Of the food man himself must partake, even if he does not provide it. Man's religious life may be compared to a double-edged sword. The upper edge bears the name of grace, the lower edge good works. Both unite in a point, and that point is the Christian character. Man ought to receive from God as if God did all. Man ought to give to God as if he did all. Man ought to trust God as if God did all. Man ought to labour as if he did all.

St. John may be said to represent the Godward side in this work of the formation of character. He reclines upon His Lord's bosom; we picture him also as sitting at his Master's feet listening in rapt admiration to the Divine words. We picture him after the ascension of Christ as still remaining, with awestruck gaze directed heavenwards, to catch the voice of inspiration. We judge that St. James, the Lord's brother, bishop of the great mother-church at Jerusalem is a type of the manward side in character-building. He is absorbed in all the manifold labours of his charge. He is a type of the Christian at work. St. Paul may be cited as one who unites in his character and writings both the Godward and the manward side. He at once works himself, yet knowing that it is God that works within him. He himself presses towards the mark, but the mark is the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ. He, laying aside every weight, runs with patience the race; but he also looks unto Jesus the author and finisher of his character. He fights the good fight, finishes the course, keeps the faith. But he also knows that the crown of righteousness is not of his earning, but is the gift of God.

THE LATE REV. AUBREY L. MOORE.

THE epidemic of influenza arrived in Oxford rather late, but it is now raging with considerable intensity. About one-third of the people employed at the University Printing Press are *hors de combat*, so are a considerable number of the employés at the post-office and at some of the principal shops. The number of absentees caused by it at the beginning of term in the different colleges is considerable, and in some cases very large. Among the resident senior members of the University not many up to the present time seem to have fallen victims to it. But the University has suffered one almost irreparable loss through the death occasioned by it of Mr. Aubrey L. Moore. Mr. Moore has been growing in influence and importance ever since he returned to Oxford in 1881. It is hardly too much to say that he has lately occupied an unique position up here. A keen student of natural science, botany, zoology, and the more recent developments of the theories of biology, he was profoundly convinced, as many articles and reviews contributed to the *Guardian* showed, not only that theology had

nothing to fear from the advance of such branches of knowledge, but that in many ways that very advance would be helpful to theology and would vivify and enlighten its views. Nature was not something (so he conceived) separate from God, a machine which He merely set in motion and left to take care of itself, but was the very expression of His will, the garment in which that will clothed itself. And so, he held, the more we understand of the living ways of nature the more we shall enter into the will of God Himself. Holding such a position, he could not fail to be an attractive force for those who were themselves students of natural science, who recognised that in him they had a theologian who at least entered into and appreciated their point of view; while, on the other hand, there were not a few anxious spirits among believers who felt that their faith need not be troubled if one who had so far greater insight into the modern theories that modern science had started than they could claim themselves saw nothing in those theories that was alarming or distressing, but rather what was helpful and enlightening. And so it came about that he, more than most, earned the blessing of the peacemakers. Nor was it in this point alone that his anxiety to mediate between the old and the new displayed itself. When last spring Professor Cheyne's Bampton Lectures had drawn prominent attention to the development which the criticism of the Old Testament was taking in our time, no one was more desirous than Mr. Moore that Churchmen should not prematurely commit themselves to views and positions which the progress of knowledge might force them subsequently to modify or abandon. It was by his initiation and at his suggestion that the Professor of Hebrew was induced to expound in a masterly paper to a body of clerical tutors and lecturers what he regarded as the position of Old Testament criticism at the present time. In that paper the Professor indicated what might be considered as fairly established, what was still doubtful and open to question, and what might be treated as mere rash conjecture and hypothesis. It fell to Mr. Moore himself to point out the importance of the *data* thus furnished and the practical inferences it was desirable to draw from the summary of the state of the question submitted to the meeting. This he did with a masterly hand, and not a few of those who listened must have gone away not only with their minds enlightened on the subject, but also with their hearts reassured. I have mentioned these two points as illustrating the kind of position which Mr. Moore filled in relation to the University at large, a position which it will be hard indeed to find any one else to occupy and maintain. Of the work which he did as Tutor and Lecturer in the different colleges with which he was associated, and of the great charm which he exercised over those with whom he was brought in contact, others will, no doubt, write to you in detail.

We are glad to hear that of the Bishop of St. Albans there are very good accounts. At the beginning of last week he was able to leave his bedroom, and on Thursday, the day being very fine at Danbury, he was able to drive out in a carriage. He is considered to be better now than he has been for several months. The Bishop however, still shows signs of weakness when attempting to walk.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

Ephes. i. 10. Col. i. 20.

Sir,—An attempt has been made in modern times to graft upon these two texts of Scripture the notion that the punishment in hell will not be endless; but that it will be corrective and beneficial, so that after having suffered awhile the "castigations of a purgatorial correction, the devil, whom the Bible declares shall be "tormented for ever and ever," together with those "who defile," and that "work abominations," and that "make lies," of whom it is said that they "shall in no wise enter into the city of the new Jerusalem; that all these and such like shall, by some "momentous process" unknown to revelation, unheard of in the annals of time, and unperceived by mortal ken, be fitted and prepared for eternal glory, with all those who had "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." A proposition so startling as this requires no small amount of hardihood to attempt to put it forward—but men are very bold in these days, and some minds are so constituted as to reject the evidence contained in a plain text of Scripture in favour of their own conceits. Were such a notion as this to go unchecked it would do an incalculable amount of mischief, by opening wider still the floodgates of wickedness; and take away all necessity for preaching the doctrine of repentance in order to escape from the "wrath to come;" because if people will certainly escape from that wrath by the "momentous process" above referred to, there will be little or no need for repentance now; people might, or might not repent, just as they liked. An irreparable injury would thus be done to one of the oldest and grandest doctrines of the Christian system; a doctrine which formed the basis of John's preaching, the theme of our Lord's ministry, and the constant subject of apostolic teaching. In order to try, in however small a way, to help in averting such a catastrophe, let us prayerfully, calmly, and briefly examine these two texts.

In verses 8 and 9 of Ephes. i., the Apostle told them that God had "abounded towards them in all wisdom and prudence," by having made known to them the mystery of His will," which mystery was, he says in verse 10, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of the times he might *gather* together in one (that is in one body, or under one head) all the things which are in Christ; both which are in heaven and which are on earth. In Col. i. 20, he says it pleased the Father that "having made peace through the blood of Christ's Cross, to *reconcile* all these things unto himself."

Now it is plain that hell is not here mentioned at all. Every sane person will admit that the people in heaven and earth no more include the people in hell than the people in London and Oxford include the people in Dublin. This, of itself, is a sufficient refutation of the notion that the final restoration theory is to be found in these two texts.

But *who* are they that are thus gathered into one? Not the whole "intelligent creation" of devils and lost spirits. We have seen above that that is impossible. It is also forbidden by the construction of the language. It is those who are "*in Christ*" that are gathered. The

ἐν τῷ χριστῷ limits the τὰ πάντα. The τὰ πάντα is not taken absolutely. To be "in Christ" is a frequent phrase to denote those who are His by faith. See Rom. viii. 1, 2 Cor. v. 17. The τὰ πάντα is anticipative, and the ἐν τῷ χριστῷ supply the anticipation. The phrase is equivalent to τὰ πάντα ὄντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ. It is used in this way in St. John xvii. 7-10. This is confirmed by our Lord telling us that it is *His own* that He gathers, and how He gathers them. He does not gather the tares and the wheat indiscriminately; He does not, by a "momentous process," change the tares into wheat; but rather *separates* the one from the other, and while He gathers the wheat into His garner, He casts the tares into the flames of an unquenchable fire.

And it is still further confirmed by considering what is meant by the "heavens and the earth." "J. B." seems to take this phrase as implying the whole "intelligent creation" of devils, holy angels, and men. If this were true, it would include the heaven, which is the peculiar home of the blessed, where Christ is; and then when the Apostle speaks of God "reconciling" all the things in this heaven to Himself—it would imply that there are things in this heaven *need* reconciliation. But this is not true. All the saints in heaven were reconciled to God by faith in Christ before they went there, and consequently need no reconciliation now; and the holy angels, who never sinned, require it not; while for the devil there is no such thing as reconciliation; he being "tormented for ever and ever, in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. The "Ministry of reconciliation was committed" to men: 2 Cor. v. 18: we never read of it as being committed to devils. This extravagant interpretation must therefore be rejected. We will perceive the true meaning of the phrase if we recollect that to be distinguished for civil or spiritual privileges is spoken of as being in heaven. "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven:" Matthew xi. 23. It is under this idea of exaltation that the rulers, or *governing* classes, in Church or State; either among Jews or Gentiles; are spoken of as the "heaven" of that state or kingdom, while the "earth" signifies those who are *governed*. The phrase is so used in reference to Babylon, in Isaiah xiii. 10; in reference to Egypt, in Ezek. xxxii. 7, 8; in reference to Jerusalem, in Matt. xxiv. 29. A notable instance of the usuage is in Daniel viii. 10, where Antiochus Epiphanes is represented as "casting down some of the *host of heaven*, and the stars to the *ground*, and stamping upon them." He is spoken of in the same way in 2 Macc. ix. 10. This is the meaning of the phrase in the two texts at the head of this letter; and their meaning simply is that by the "ministry of reconciliation" Christ would gather the saved from among the governing and the governed classes both among Jews and Gentiles. With this agrees the song of the redeemed in heaven: "for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every *kindred* and *tongue*, and *people* and *nation*." This interpretation is demanded by the context of the two passages. In Ephes. i. 9, the Apostle speaks of a "*mystery* as having been made known," which mystery, he says in verse 10, was "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times" God "might gather together in one all things in Christ: both which are in heaven and in earth"; and in chap. iii. 3, he speaks of the same mystery as having been made known, and then defines it, in verse 6, as being "that the *Gentiles* should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the *gospel*." We are now able to see the force of the two little words "*in one*," in Ephes. i. 10: that He might gather together the "all things" among the Jews, and the "all things" among the Gentiles, into *one* body under Christ, the head. This idea of *unity* or *oneness* among Jew and Gentile is the leading doctrine in both the Epistle to the Ephesians and Colossians. "*One* God and Father" for both Jew and Gentile; "*one* Lord, *one* faith, *one* baptism"; "*one* head"; "one body," "one new man," "one Temple." That the "gathering," or "reconciling," refers to a process going on in *time*, and not in eternity, is evident from the "fulness of times"; a phrase used to denominate the Christian Dispensation. How closely St. Paul followed our Lord in his words and thoughts is evident from comparing the τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν of Ephes. i. 10 with πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός of St. Mark i. 15. That I have started no novel theory in thus interpreting these two texts is evident from the fact that many good men entertained the same notion long before me. See Burkitt, Clarke and Newcome.

In these texts we find nothing of a "momentous process" of compulsion, of "castigations" or of "burnings;" nothing but the simple, yet glorious doctrine of reconciliation with God, by faith in Christ Jesus; "which Gospel is being preached to every creature under heaven;" and shall so continue to be preached until the sound of the last trump, when the "dead in Christ" shall be raised *first*, to hear the glad sound, "*Come* ye *blessed* of my Father."

In no way do they give the slightest hint of the final restoration theory of all mankind. No mind accustomed to anything like proof, or rigour of reasoning, would have brought forward such texts in support of such a theory. I hope, therefore, that "J. B." will not again produce them for the same purpose. He may believe that his theory is there, but if he does he believes without reason. And he may assert it to be there, but if he does, he asserts without proof.

January 15th, 1890.

R. DONALDSON.

"PERFECTLY ABSURD."

SIR,—There is, says the wise man, a vein for gold and a vein for silver. We may add, "and there are many veins in man. There is a vein for humour and a vein for sarcasm, etc. I confess that, in replying to your correspondents, I am disposed at times to draw upon other veins than those I do. To refrain requires an effort. Modesty, perhaps, should have stayed my hand here; but there is such a thing, notwithstanding, as manliness.

"J. B." says that "my sentence appears hopelessly incoherent." Now, assertion is not proof. We want proof. Give us proof.

I do not know, I cannot tell what was in "J. B."'s mind. I can only and do only deal with what he writes. If what he wrote did not imply that all men were to be made happy, by some process, or processes, after death, then I do not yet understand the meaning of the words in the English language.

But, now, let us take and consider what he has written in your last issue. There he puts the question thus, "whether, at the close of life, they are prepared for a safe, holy, and happy immortality?" Who are *they?* All men? If *all men*, why then, of course, it

implies that all men, after death, have to be prepared. But some are prepared. Then it follows that some have not to be prepared. But is not this the same thing over again? And is it not "perfectly absurd" to talk in this manner? Will "J. B." assert that no man is prepared?

After this "J. B." treats us to an explanation of the meaning and use of the word Atonement. I do not object to his thinking that I need to be taught the meaning and use of words in ordinary English; but I do not think that such a mode of procedure is very complimentary to your many readers. Surely they are not so devoid of nous.

It is a great pity that, in dealing with solemn and momentous subjects, one feels called upon to administer such rebukes; but the greater pity is that there should be a cause.

Once for all, then, let me say that I understand by the word "Atonement," the doctrine that goes by that name. "Christ died for the ungodly."

The question is not what "J. B." thinks about this doctrine; but what God says. The Bible nowhere says that God will reconcile, by the Atonement, those who do not wish to be reconciled. But the Saviour does say, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

I showed "J. B." clearly enough that, if after his way, "reconciling all things unto himself" were taken absolutely, then God would reconcile sin, death, hell, etc., to Himself. It savours of blasphemy, I confess to write it. I am glad to see that "J.B." recoils from such an interpretation. But then, he says, I consider it imperative to interpret the texts about sin, Satan, hell, and all punishment of sin in a manner consistent with the glorious design of God. In other words, as if these things were not. Take any word of the many—hell for instance. But there is no Hell. Men are to be prepared by a *process* for a safe, holy, and happy immortality. The word is a myth. What sort of reasoning is this?

"J. B." tells us that universalists regard the Atonement as a glorious fact on which our hopes of salvation are built; they know of no other basis on which to found hope." Then are they Christians indeed. But what then about the process after death? And what of this fact? The dead out of Christ have no hope.

"We love Him because He first loved us." Yes, but the unprepared do not love. "While we were enemies Christ died for us." The *while* implies a change from enemies to friends; but the unprepared are still enemies. "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us." Yes, but many will not hear the beseechment. Where is the connection?

"It is by virtue of the Atonement that we have this process." In other words, we are to shut our eyes and ears to the clear declaration of God's Word and Will, and substitute the opinions of fallible men. What takes place at death is not what God says; but what men chose to think and wish. We have positively no intimation whatever that any change can take place after death. It is certainly not in the Bible. If it is, where is it? Where is the process explained, defined, hinted at?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Jan. 18th.

P.S.—Will "J. B." kindly indicate one universalist writer who regards the Atonement as the basis of all hope?

ST. JOHN VI.

SIR,—I do not intend to enter into any question as to Mr. Faber's book now, or as to the connection between the Holy Communion and St. John vi. What I want to know is, did the flesh which Jesus says He will give for the life of the world come down from heaven? All else is beside the question, and fails to touch the real point at all. I may add that as Mr. E. Lawrence has omitted to state where the grammatical error exists I am still at a loss to discover it.

INQUIRENS.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—Much of Mr. Sandlands' letter in the PULPIT of the 11th inst. is written with such conciseness—omitting implied links of argument—as to be unintelligible to me. But there is one notion of his which admits of distinct reply. He seems to think that everlasting punishment cannot be denied without denying the atonement of Christ. This notion is, I believe, held by very many; and though it is utterly unreasonable, we can see how it comes to be held. Those who have no sufficient sense of the evil of sin naturally deny both its punishment and its atonement; and these two denials are supposed to be somehow necessarily connected.

But I am one of very many who deny everlasting punishment for the opposite reason: that because the death of Christ is a full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction, oblation, and atonement for all sin, there is no sin which can remain ultimately undestroyed and unhealed.

In reply to the question "Where (in Holy Scripture) is this taught?" I answer, in its most familiar passage: "All enemies shall be abolished, and God shall be all in all."

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 15th January, 1890.

INACCURATE LANGUAGE.

SIR,—Bishop Bethel in his "Baptismal Regeneration," quotes Bishop Bull, after Grotius, to the effect, "*locutiones incautas res sequuntur temerariæ*," that is, rash actions follow incautious teachings. You have an admirable sermon by Archdeacon Farrar in your number for this week. But allow me to call attention to two *locutiones incautæ* which may lead to serious error. He speaks of conversion as our being "born of God." But this contradicts the doctrine of the Prayer Book, that in Baptism we are adopted by God. In conversion we only return to that divine state of sonship given us at the Font. Again, on the same page 25, he says, "this infection remaineth, even in them that are regenerate, and yet even they, in their unregenerate days, have not been sold under sin, etc." Now plainly, unregenerate state means here the unconverted state. But this is directly contrary to the Prayer Book. I am sorry to have to find fault with what is otherwise so excellent. But *obsta principiis* must be our motto, especially on a point so much misunderstood as all about Baptismal Grace. Of

course, Archdeacon Farrar's language may not be *incauta*, as if spoken by a Ryle, a Close, or a Spurgeon; but, if merely *incauta*, it may do much mischief. Thus Secker's language, and that of others, led to the wretched Gorham decision.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

FUNERAL REFORM.—Dean Goulbourn has written from West Brighton to the Hon. Sec. of the Burial Reform Association as follows:—"Christians are expressly warned 'not to sorrow for them which sleep in Jesus, *even as others which have no hope!* But the warning has not been laid to heart. The heathen view of Death as a hopeless and irretrievable disaster has had a long and firm hold upon the minds of professing disciples of Christ. One may see its influence in much of the poetry on the subject of Death which has been written by Christians, who yet have intended nothing less than to throw any doubt upon the hopes held out by Revelation. The dreary trappings and suits of woe exhibited by the old-fashioned funeral were the outward visible signs of this heathen sentiment of hopelessness and despair. Your Association has already done much, and will do more, to make funerals modest, and, as far as is suitable, bright in their surroundings, and to dissipate the gloom which they were wont to inspire. Only God's gift of Faith can correct what was wrong in the inward sentiment, but the efforts of your Association are surely in a right direction, and I trust that His blessing may so rest upon them, that brighter views than have hitherto prevailed, of the future of those 'who have departed this life in His faith and fear,' may be abroad in the moral and spiritual atmosphere."

THE development of the cycling industry was never more marked than at the present time. The list of the exhibitors at the Stanley Show, which opens at the Crystal Palace on Friday the 24th inst., contains the name of the Armstrong Company, Limited, who as cycle manufacturers show for the first time. Every inch of space in the vast building at Sydenham has been requisitioned, yet even then a large number of exhibitors have had to curtail their exhibits for want of sufficient space. Truly the cycle trade is making vast strides, as is fully evidenced by the fact that only a few years ago the small Floral Hall at Covent Garden was found large enough to accommodate the whole of the then makers, while at the present moment, the trade appears to have even outgrown the accommodation of the largest building in the kingdom. Last year nearly 100,000 people visited this exhibition during the week. That number will no doubt be far exceeded next week.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Commeline, Rev. Archibald Samuel, M.A., Chaplain York County Hospital.
Davenport, Rev. John Reginald, Rector of Skeffington, Leicestershire.
De la Bere, Rev. John Baghot, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Buxted, Sussex.
Edersheim, Rev. Alfred, B.A., Curate of Kegworth; Rector of Blaisdon, Gloucestershire.
Fowke, Rev. Oliver Lyme, M.A.,, Rector of Preston, Rutland.
Gordon, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Latimer Road, Notting Hill.
Harrison, Rev. Edward Theophilus Boileau, B.A., Rector of North Hinksey, Berks.
Heygate, Rev. R. T., M.A., Clerk in Orders of Leeds Parish Church.
Jones, Canon Hugh, Vicar of Llanrwst, St. Asaph; Prebendary of Llanefydd, in St. Asaph Cathedral.
Kelly, Rev. Maitland, M.A., Vicar of Salcombe and Rural Dean of Woodleigh; Vicar of Ottery St. Mary, Devonshire.
Knight, Rev. H. W., Curate of St. Andrew's, Ancoats; Rector of St. Margaret's, Laceby, Great Grimsby.
Lloyd, Rev. Henry, Curate of Amlwch, Anglesey; Vicar of Aberdaron, Carnarvonshire.
Lupton, Rev. J. H., M.A., Sur-Master of St. Paul's School; Preacher to the Honourable Society of Gray's Inn.
Oriel, Rev. Henry Segar, M.A.,; Vicar of Weybread, Suffolk.
Polwhele, Rev. Arthur Baskerville, B.A.; Vicar of Preston Deanery, Northamptonshire.
Prichard, Rev. Richard Williams, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Stoke, Chester.
Richardson, Rev. J. B., M.A.; Incumbent of Holy Trinity, Formby, Liverpool.
Robinson, Rev. Wilfrid, B.A.; Rector of East Acklam, York.
Smith, Rev. Herbert Giles Brabant, Rector of Wendon Lofts and Vicar of Elmdon, Essex.
Thomas, Rev. Ernest Winthrop, Licensed to Officiate in St. Columba's Mission Church, in the Parish of Holy Trinity, Harrow Green.
Williams, Rev. J. P., Chaplain of the County Lunatic Asylum, Exminster.
Wilson, Rev. Henry Andrew, M.A., Vicar of Rufforth, York.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bull, Rev. William John, M.A., from 1853 to 1888 Assistant-Master of Harrow School, at Mountside, Harrow-on-the-Hill, on the 14th inst., aged 65.
Crake, Rev. Augustine David, B.A., Vicar of Cholsey, on the 18th inst., aged 53.
Egan, Rev. John Cruice, M.A., M.D., Vicar, at Christ Church Vicarage, South Hackney, on the 14th inst., aged 68.
Hayman, Rev. Henry, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Hoxton, at 5, Ventnor Villas, West Brighton, on the 20th inst., aged 49.
Holt, Rev. Eardley Chauncy, at The Cottage, Upper East Sheen, on the 17th inst., aged 71.
Lendrum, Rev. Alexander, at Blatherwycke Rectory, Wansford, on the 14th inst., aged 78.
Montefiore, Rev. Thomas Law, M.A., Vicar of Chideock, and twenty-eight years Rector of Catherstone Leweston, Dorchester, at Chideock Vicarage, on the 13th inst., aged 64.
Moore, Rev. Aubrey Lackington, Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford, and Honorary Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, at 2, Keble Road, Oxford, on the 17th inst., aged 41.
Rose, Rev. Hugh Francis, formerly Rector of Humersfield (with St. Cross), at Holme Rose, N.B., on the 13th inst., aged 69.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE DIVINE SAVIOUR.

By the Bishop of ROCHESTER.

Sermon Preached in St. Pancras Parish Church on Christmas Day, December 25th, 1889.

"God sent forth his Son made of a woman."—Gal. iv. 4.

ABOUT one part of this sentence there is, there can be, no controversy—that Jesus of Nazareth was "made of a woman;" nor will it be disputed that the time when He appeared was singularly opportune, whether we regard it from the standpoint of the moral despair of human society, or of the facilities of intercourse which the iron civilisation of Rome had, for military even more than for commercial purposes, steadily developed, or of the two great languages which practically monopolised and expressed the thoughts and plans of mankind.

It is true indeed that, as He has been well described, Christ was the great surprise in history. But so have all the leaders of the world been in turn whenever they have appeared; and it is not inconsistent with the almost universal expectations of His advent.

Nor, once more, can there be much controversy as to the object of His coming, whether we adopt the angel's statement of Him, that He should save His people from their sins, or the Apostle's, "that we might receive the adoption of sons."

These are but different aspects of the great work of salvation which Jesus came to accomplish. Adoption to be the sons of God implies and carries forgiveness; to be forgiven by God is to be admitted into His heart. Even to pagans, in their own vague, dim way, the coming universal King was to be in some sense a Saviour.

Yes, let us insist on this again and again as the substance of our faith and the ground of our hope, and the stirring of our love, and the chorus of our song, to-day is our Saviour's birthday. "Unto you is born this day in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." The question, however, is—Is He really Saviour: Saviour in the only way in which He can possibly save us? The sentence about which there is a controversy, and over which the wise men of the world still dispute with the Church, is that not only was He "made of a woman," but that He was also Son of God in the mystery of the Incarnation, sent by His Father to save. The Word was made "flesh" to-day, and tabernacled among us, that we might behold His glory.

My brethren, everything that touches our salvation hangs on this truth. If Jesus of Nazareth was also the Son of God, no doubt we bow down before a vast and solemn mystery—the mystery of Godliness, something transcending all human experience, and outside what we understand and describe as natural law—"God manifest in the flesh."

We do see a miracle here, but only because and when we may see it, can we also grasp an accomplished salvation.

If He was not the Son of God, and in no special way made of a woman, and sent into the world, all that the Gospels do for us is to conduct us by a path of thrilling and solemn beauty to the door of a closed tomb. The history of Jesus is but an unspeakable disappointment, and we are yet in our sins.

The Babe of Bethlehem may have had His infancy heralded by pathetic melodies, and His manhood environed by beautiful incidents, such as no other book can tell. But, like all the rest of us, He was born only to die; He tried to save, but His life was a failure and His death a defeat.

We will muffle our bells, stop our carol-singing, shut our churches, confer no longer over our touching but mythical Gospel.

If there is no Divine Saviour, there is no divine society. "No man may redeem his brother." The Church is either a dream or a lie; and it does not matter which. St. Paul, however, says, "God sent forth His Son made of a woman."

And surely in the expression "made of a woman" there is, as has been profoundly observed, the latent inference that He was not made as other men are, of woman and man too; or why should this description of Him have been given, which would occur to none of us about each other? Let us for a moment glance not so much on the claims about His origin, as on the facts of His life; and we shall conclude that even a greater miracle than His supernatural birth, or His resurrection from the dead, is to be discovered in the simple annals which describe the life lived and the death died for the salvation of the world.

The doctrine which He taught, the character which He exhibited, and the power which He used, all bear the same witness, and emphasise the one conclusion—"Truly this was the Son of God."

He came to be a teacher: in other words, to save us by the truth.

His own account of Himself to Pilate was "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness unto the truth." This truth He uttered with authority. He had not gained it from human sources, and the taunt against Him was, "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" while some asked in genuine wonder, "Whence has this man this wisdom?" Others

said in spite of themselves and against themselves, "Never man spake like this man." When Jesus came into the world, the priests, at whose lips men ought to have sought knowledge, had abdicated their great duty to the scribes.

But the scribes had overlaid and corrupted the divine law with burdensome and gratuitous and paralysing details, making the lives of sincere men an utter burden to them, and teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

In two chief particulars, as has been acutely remarked, the law of the scribes overweighted and materialised the law of God, and in each of them Jesus of Nazareth defied them to the uttermost. One was the Sabbath, the other the kingdom.

The Sabbath had been made a day of infinite and degrading bondage by details of a ridiculous and monstrous exactness, and Jesus without a moment's hesitation met them and opened battle, and deliberately controverted and shocked them as publicly and decisively as He could. Hypocrite He once called a ruler of the synagogue for murmuring at His healing of a poor paralysed woman. His doctrine was, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

Then with respect to the coming kingdom, ever since the day of Maccabean martyrdoms the Jews had looked forward with a kind of fierce delight to the promised King, Who should drive the Roman eagles into the sea, make Jerusalem free and the joy of the whole earth, wash out in rivers of blood the old deep stains on their national dignity, and trample on the neck of their enemies as their enemies had trampled on them. But when the people seized a favourable moment for making Him a King, and unfurling the standard of revolt under One Who plainly wielded supernatural power, He instantly disappointed them more flagrantly, more bitterly than ever. He told them as He told Pilate afterwards, that His kingdom was not of this world—that it did not come by observation, was not an affair of princes and soldiers and statecraft and bloodshed, but that it was something within them; what St. Paul afterwards called it—righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. He Who in His first great sermon resolutely broke with the Pharisees in saying, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," had no other answer for them, when they placed their lives at His disposal, than one which they must have hated and despised. "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven."

Verily, indeed, was the sentence of Nicodemus about Him true—"We know that Thou art a Teacher come from God." When He said of Himself in His last discourse that He was "the way, the truth, and the life," He made good His words.

But if His teaching was unique in its boldness and in its doctrine and in its originality, so was His character.

It has often been said that it would be even a greater strain on our reason to suppose that the unlettered Apostles could have invented that moral ideal out of their own consciousness than that they simply described what their eyes saw and their ears heard of the word of life.

It has not, however, always been so constantly remembered that the daily intercourse and familiarity of three years must have disclosed some flaw or inconsistency in Him, had it been already there; and that none were noticed simply because they did not exist.

In three respects His character dominates over our moral experience like a mighty Alp over a swampy plain. All perfections met and united in Him; the manly and the feminine, the tender and the strong, the unquailing courage, and a love passing the love of women; bountifulness of heart with economy of resource. All His perfections were in perfect symmetry and proportion. It was a moral equilibrium, and no excrescence or exaggeration could ever be detected in Him to justify the observation that this action or that was characteristic. Nothing predominated there, and nothing lacked. Once more, all these faculties and qualities of soul were in harmonious and concurrent movement. One never interfered with another, nor overshadowed another. He reflected while He felt, and He spared while He gave.

Though He never wasted power, He never grudged kindness; and at the moment when thousands of mouths had been fed easily, bountifully, perhaps unconsciously with divinely multiplied food from His hands, He could say calmly and naturally, "Gather up the fragments which remain, that nothing be lost."

Once more consider the mightiness and the secret of His power. The Church of God, with all her imperfections and divisions, is at this moment the most irresistible and potent and advancing force under the sun; and the reason is that the Church is the Body of Christ. Even during His life, over the common people who heard Him gladly, and the chief rulers, who secretly believed on Him, and the High Priest who felt He must be got out of the way as soon as possible, and the heathen soldier, who at the moment of His apparent defeat exclaimed, "Truly this was a righteous man;" and over the fickle crowd and in a degree over worldly Pilate He wielded a supreme power. He died, because it pleased Him to die. He rose, because death could not have dominion over Him. The priests made His sepulchre sure, and the soldiers watched; but Jesus triumphed.

His own prediction has been abundantly accomplished: "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me."

Over rough and gentle, over philosopher and peasant, over the savage and the courtier, over the

little child and the dying patriarch, falls sweetly and solemnly the marvellous spell of His redeeming love. "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds" is an experience which belongs to all of us who have taken His dear yoke upon us. As the sound of many waters, from the glorified lips of a great multitude which no man can number, shall presently rise as a tribute of His omnipotent mercy, the new, the everlasting song, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain."

Out of weakness He, too, was made strong, "made of a woman." He was also the Eternal Son. To conclude, He is still Teacher, and Divine Teacher; which means that there is a Providence in His government of the Church, which He does not always explain to impatient disciples; and that He is often pleased to instruct us by methods, which at first sight we distrust, and by teaching, which we are tempted to reject, only because it is strange.

He sees, as we cannot see, if there are aspects of truth which have not been sufficiently presented; or even tracts of doctrine, over which our feet have never been guided to walk. So at His own good time He compensates us for our loss by wisely supplying the need; and while He takes no pleasure in an intellectual levity or shallowness which forbids cherished truth to take deep root, and shoot up living principles, and knows not what is meant by holding fast the faithful word, He always claims from us teachableness and humility.

While He is even stern to that supercilious arrogance which claims, if unconsciously, a monopoly of Divine teaching, and almost angrily rejects, as contrary to God's Word, the doctrine that seems to clash with our own, He would distinctly remind us that truth is many-sided, and Scripture an unfathomable reservoir of living water, and that the Holy Spirit teaches and uses and blesses others than ourselves; and that the meek He will guide in judgment, the meek He will teach His way. It is not in the least essential in a place where we come to worship as well as to listen—though, indeed, it may be more immediately helpful to us—that we should entirely or instantly agree with all the presentation of truth delivered to us.

Indeed, I am not sure that some minds at least do not learn more from the collision of ideas than from the harmony of them, and that to be made to think is not more wholesome than to be able continually to agree.

It is essential that we should respect our teacher as one who longs to walk in the light of God himself and to help us to walk in it.

It is also essential that we should think, weigh, compare, pray, and then decide.

We meet here to-day to offer to the Crowned Infant of Bethlehem what has been deliberately done with a view to His honour, and the more worthily rendering Him true and laudable service.

The Church we love has, no doubt, a look of change to-day. Changes there have been and changes there will be, because the Church is a living Church, and there must be change where there is life.

The Church Universal has had her great epochs—the first when she constructed her creeds; the second when she formulated her worship; the third when she developed her activities. In a real sense we must observe the spirit of the times, or the times will leave us behind; we shall be stranded on a shore, covered with paltry ruins.

Your choir to-day enters on a new era.

To those who remember with what stately and yet simple grandeur that great artist Henry Smart once led the service of song in this church any change may seem to bring a loss with it.

But it is not a question of bringing back what cannot be brought back, it is simply the initiating of a method of choral worship which in most of the great churches in the metropolis has long been a recognised fact, and to which, if the music is good and the choir devout, you will soon, I am persuaded, become happily reconciled.

Only let the singing of St. Pancras be still congregational. Let your contribution to-day towards the £500 still wanted be liberal and willing; most of all give your earnest and sincere intercessions for a great spiritual blessing on him who is now set over you in the Lord, and of whose earnest desire to win you to Christ and to edify you into Christ and to use you for Christ probably not one person in the church this morning—certainly not one who has even the slightest acquaintance with him—can have the faintest doubt.

Pray for him, and your prayers will come back to you in blessing.

Christ is still our example. He still says, "If any man serve Me let him follow Me." To follow Christ is to have the mind of Christ—humility transfigured with love.

"If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you." Let me, my beloved friends, say this: of all that I have heard of the Churchworkers in this parish, and I have often heard, nothing has gladdened me more (yet I cannot say that it much surprised me) than to hear that all stood faithful to their duty and did not desert their posts merely because the undershepherd of the sheep was changed.

It showed that you had been working for Christ and not for self, and so Christ kept you true. In that blessed loyalty may you long abide.

For Christ is still King, and a strong King, and a King Whose kingdom is growing.

Let Him be altogether King in your cleansed and consecrated hearts, and then of the love which passeth knowledge you shall have continual and ineffable glimpses, and the peace which passeth

understanding shall be as a garrison to your souls against worldliness, sloth, and discord.

To-day we cannot help thinking how many we care for have passed into the unseen world, to see the King in His beauty, Whom we can now see only with the eyes of the heart.

Time passes, and we pass with it; and for each of us presently there shall be time no longer.

It is more than thirty-five years since I first preached in this church, one July Sunday evening, for the Middlesex Hospital; just twenty years to-day since I preached my first Christmas sermon to you as my flock, and since that how many who have worshipped here have passed within the veil, to grasp and enjoy the only realities; and in the august society of the spirits of the just made perfect to taste the fruition of God.

O let Christ be your King, and yield yourselves to the power of His constraining love, and open your hearts that He may be born afresh in them this day as your personal and adorable Saviour.

Then, as your reward, He will join you altogether in the unity of the Spirit which is the bond of peace; and by that alchemy of love, which has already made you sons, will make you brethren.

On this great church and parish, and on all who worship and listen, and serve and teach here, may the continual benediction rest of Him Who as a child loves children, as a man understands men, as a teacher has the keys of knowledge, as a Saviour yearns with a love that no words can utter for the salvation of each one of you.

He is the same Saviour who has been preached and worshipped here for so long; Who, I sincerely and heartily believe, will still be preached and worshipped and loved and served for the years in front of us. He Whom God sent forth, made of a woman, is "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

TOPHET AND ITS ANTITYPE.

By the Rev. WILLIAM POPE, M.A., Rector.

A Sermon Preached at St. Nicholas' Church, Church, Nottingham.

"For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it."—Isaiah xxx. 33.

IT is written, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb. x. 31). It is written again, "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord" (Rom. xii. 19). Manifold are the judgments which He is able to execute upon His obstinate enemies. How hopeless was it for the proud king of Assyria, the oppressor of God's people Israel, to think for a moment that He could escape the righteous indignation of the Lord God Almighty! Here, in the 28th verse of our chapter, is "an overflowing stream, reaching to the midst of the neck"—so should the Assyrian army be swept away as though by the irresistible current of the strong flowing tide. Then, in the same verse, there is "the sieve of vanity" wherewith Jehovah can treat the nations as "the small dust of the balance" (Is. xl. 15). Then, again, there is the "bridle in the jaws of the people," wherewith He restrains them from doing what *they* would, and turns them whither *He* will. Then there are the staff and rod with which the Assyrian should be beaten down; and finally there is Tophet, of which such terrible things are spoken in our text. "God is angry with the wicked every day. If he turn not, He will whet His sword: He hath bent His bow and made it ready. He hath also prepared for him the instruments of death: He ordaineth His arrows against the persecutors" (Ps. vii. 11-13).

I invite you this morning, my brethren, to consider our text, first of all,

I. With reference to Tophet itself.—"The Valley of Hinnom" was another name for Tophet; or rather, speaking more strictly, the valley included Tophet as one of its chief groves or gardens. It lay somewhere south or south-east of Jerusalem, and was not far from the "Potter's Field," where Judas Iscariot hung himself and "went unto his own place." In the first instance it seems to have been a spot of special beauty, and to have formed part of the king's pleasure grounds. Its name is thought to signify "the place of tabrets"; if so, it was probably the king's music grove, denoting originally nothing evil or hateful. Some, however, explain it as meaning "the place of drums," because drums were beaten to drown the cries of the burning victims, infants sacrificed there to the god Moloch. Anyhow, it is a fact that these abominations were in course of time practised in the valley. King Ahaz, king Manasseh, and the idolatrous Jews made their children pass through the fire in honour of the Pagan fire-god. Thus they filled the place with the blood of innocents, as did the heathen whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel. In consequence of these abominations good king Josiah, in his holy work of reformation, took care to "defile" Tophet, *i.e.* he made it ceremonially unclean by spreading over it human bones and other corruptions. It then became the common cesspool of the city, and in its deep narrow gorge it is said that fires were kept constantly burning, partly for sanitary reasons, and also in order that the dead bodies of criminals, the carcases of animals, and whatever else defiled the holy city, might be thrown into it and consumed. It was afterwards called "The Valley of Slaughter." In succeeding ages blood flowed there in streams; corpses, buried and unburied, have filled up the hollows, and there can be no doubt that underneath the gardens and terraces of the modern Jerusalem there lie not only the ruins of the old city, but the

bones and dust of millions—Romans, Persians, Jews, Greeks, Crusaders, Moslems.

We are now prepared to see the meaning of our text in its first application. "Tophet is ordained of old"—or "Tophet is set in order from yesterday;" "yea, for the king (of Assyria) it is prepared"—*i.e.* Hezekiah had prepared it to receive the dead bodies of Israel's enemies, the corpses of the soldiers of the Assyrian king. "He hath made it deep and large; the pile thereof is fire and much wood," *i.e.* there shall be fuel enough to consume them all; "the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it," they shall be consumed as suddenly and effectually as if the fire were kept burning by a continual stream of brimstone. Such, against His enemies, would be the effect of the breath of the Lord, His word, His wrath. Such was Tophet. Once the choice grove of Jerusalem's choicest valley, then the place of defilement, death, and fire, then the valley of slaughter. Once the royal music-grove, where Solomon's singers with voice and instrument regaled the king, the court, and the city; then the high place of Moloch, resounding with the cries of burning infants; then (in type and symbol) the place where is "wailing and gnashing of teeth." Once prepared for the delight of Israel's king: then defiled and prepared for that other king who was the enemy of God's Israel; and as Paradise and the Garden of Eden passed into guilty Babylon, so Tophet and the Valley of Hinnom pass into "the lake of fire." These scenes are referred to by our great poet Milton, who speaks of Solomon making his grove in

> "The pleasant valley of Hinnom, Tophet thence
> And black Gehenna, called the type of hell."

We must, therefore, view our text further,

II. With reference to that of which Tophet was the type.—It is not a mere fancy on my part that Tophet was typical of something more dreadful. It is not a man-made interpretation. We have scriptural warrant for it. We have the highest of all sanctions for it, even the teaching of our Lord Himself. Unfortunately the English word "hell" has more than one meaning. Sometimes it means the place of departed spirits, as when we say in our Creed that Jesus "descended into hell." The Greek word used in Scripture and translated in this sense is "Hades," which literally signifies "the unseen." Sometimes (and far oftener) it means the abode of the lost, as when Jesus says, "It is better for thee to enter into life with one eye (*i.e.* to be a follower of Christ with self-denial) rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire" (Matt. xviii. 9). The word used in Scripture for hell in this sense is Gehenna, and this word Gehenna means "Valley of Hinnom." So you see Jesus Himself teaches us that Tophet of old was only a faint picture on earth of those abodes of unpardoned sin and unmitigated woe, where shall be "wailing and gnashing of teeth." Moreover, the prophet Isaiah, in the closing words of his last chapter, refers primarily to a scene in Tophet which has yet a larger fulfilment to come: "They shall go forth and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against Me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched" (Is. lxvi. 24); and I need not remind you that these very words are applied by Christ Himself to "the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Ought we not then to face this dread reality? Let us not hush up the subject in a spirit of spurious charity or false refinement, as though it should not be mentioned to ears polite. I, for my part, commissioned to bid my fellow-sinners "flee from the wrath to come," dare not be silent respecting it, lest the blood of any be required at my hand, and it be said "He never plainly warned me."

Reading our text, then, in this new light, on the authority of the Great Teacher, Christ Himself, we learn that this place is, "ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared," even for that great "prince of darkness," the devil with his angels, and for impenitent sinners among men who have identified themselves with Satan's service; for the proudest who think themselves not accountable to any for what they say or do, yea for kings in their own estimation it is prepared. It is "deep and large," sufficient to receive the world of the ungodly. "The pile thereof is fire and much wood"—God's wrath against sin is the fire, and sinners make themselves fuel for it; and "the breath of the Lord," the power of His anger, kindles it and keeps it kindled. It would be fruitless and unprofitable to attempt to picture the horrors which must hang around the second death—it will be wiser and safer to remind ourselves of the scriptural statements concerning it. It is spoken of, then, as a "place of torment," and is described as "everlasting punishment" (or restraint), "everlasting fire," "hell-fire," "a furnace of fire," "a lake of fire," "fire and brimstone," "unquenchable fire," devouring fire," "the bottomless pit," "prepared for the devil and his angels." We learn that the body suffers in it, that the soul suffers in it, that the evil tongue is set on fire of hell, that the beast and the false prophet shall be cast into it, that Pharisaic hypocrites make a proselyte two-fold more the child of hell than themselves, and are challenged by our Lord with the awful question, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (Luke xvi. 28, Matt. iii. 12, xiii. 42, xxiii. 15, 33, xxv. 41, 46, Rev. xx, 3, 10. Isa. xxx. 30, Jas. iii. 6.)

So fearful is the thought of that future destiny of woe that men are tempted to tamper with Scripture, and to take refuge in the doctrine of annihilation as the less of two evils. They profess to hold that the ungodly will be blotted out of existence altogether. And yet, if we be honest, we shall find that our very instincts are opposed decidedly to such a theory. There is something in existence

which a man would sooner not part with at any cost. Here and there, in intense suffering, a man may wish for the death of the body, but to be blotted out of existence altogether he never really wishes. In obedience to the same feeling we use every means to keep alive those who are near and dear to us, even at the expense of their suffering. The mother's soul recoils from the thought of shortening her child's days, however sad and sorrowful those days may be, so long as there is a chance of life being retained. It is easy to talk of annihilation, of men being brought to nothingness, but it is impossible to realise it, still less is it possible for man to effect it. In things natural and physical (as science tells us) and also in things spiritual, there is no such thing as annihilation. "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death" (Rev. ii. 11). This implies that they who die that death shall be hurt by it, but annihilation would be an end of suffering, not hurtful.

We are further to remember that the same word which in the New Testament expresses the duration of the happiness of the saved is also used to express the duration of the unhappiness of the lost. Whatever, therefore, men endeavour to prove on this point with respect to that future state of ruin must logically be concluded with respect to the future state of bliss. In the world to come Time shall be no longer. "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 18). "A short time," "a long time"—these are ideas which will then have no place and no meaning. The last we see in Scripture of the faithful is their entrance upon a second life; the last we see in Scripture of the unfaithful is their entrance upon a second death—left outside the gates of the Celestial City. The destiny of each is manifestly fixed. It stretches forth into eternity, where the dazzling glory of the Lord envelopes the one and the mist of darkness enshrouds the other. Moreover, without the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ no man shall enter into heaven: but when Christ delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father, then the office of Mediator will cease, and consequently no more admissions into glory can take place.

The future destiny of the lost is in strict accordance with justice. It seems superfluous to say this, when it is God's word which sets forth that destiny. Injustice is impossible with God. Throughout the Bible we are taught the truth and righteousness and equity of God's judgments. Yet many dare to raise their objections. One, for example, thinks it hard that sins committed in this short life should be visited by so tremendous a penalty in the life to come. Now, as I have already remarked, our ideas of time do not belong to eternity; but, besides this, it is an utter confusion of thought to imagine that the length of time occupied in the penalty must be measured by the length of time occupied in the sin. It is not so even on earth. What a momentary thing it was for Eve to put forth her hand and take the forbidden fruit! Yet by that one act "sin entered into the world," and you and I and all the human race are at this hour feeling its bitter effects. It does not take long to commit a forgery by a feigned signature, or to lay a charge of dynamite, or to perpetrate the crime of murder; yet the penalty will be imprisonment for a long period, perhaps for life, or it may be the lasting forfeiture of earthly life itself. In the face of such facts as these men are not in a position to call in question the truth stated in the Scriptures that a lifetime of sin on earth is to be followed by a future of woe in eternity. Should not God's dealings in nature, and the judicial dealings of man with man, rather prepare us for the truth concerning the lot of him who has despised God's loving offer of reconciliation?

Let none, however, think that the penalty will be arbitrarily imposed. Rather will it work in the way of strict retribution, with all the inevitable force of a natural law. Is fallen man in a state of ruin here? Perdition will be his portion hereafter, if he has neglected salvation through Christ. Is he in bondage here? he shall be bound hand and foot hereafter (Matt. xxii. 13). Is his understanding darkened here? he shall be cast into outer darkness hereafter. Is he dead in trespasses and sins here? he is to partake of the second death hereafter. Is he corrupt here? of the flesh shall he reap corruption hereafter. Divine justice itself necessitates this law.

But God is love. Even among men, a tenderly-loving father has now and again disowned and cast out an evil son lest his other children be ruined by that son's example. The judge who condemns a criminal is not a cruel man because he does so. Law must have its way, more especially if an offer of free pardon made by royalty has been deliberately refused by the convict. Love apart from Holiness, love apart from hatred of sin, love apart from justice—such love would not be Divine. If the gifts of God's love be trifled with, what more can man expect? May he expect that future punishment will correct and restore him? If man defy the threat, will the reality convert him?

The Bible distinctly teaches that now is our time of probation; but if punitive suffering is to restore, that would imply that probation is to be hereafter, and not now. Moreover, that would be sight effecting what faith has not effected. But this is entirely contrary to God's method. Would He begin by constituting us free, and end by forcing us to holiness by the power of hell-fire, whatever it be? Surely on every account we do well to meet the solemn appeal, "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?" (Heb. ii. 3).

Lost man brings the ruin on himself. He has perverted his own nature. He was not created in order to be lost; he has ruined his own soul. A sickle is not made to cut the reaper's hand, but,

from the way in which it is used such a result might follow. Therefore would we persuade men. We do not seek to frighten them; rather would we beseech them. The most vivid description of future judgments would of itself fail to win one soul to Christ. The gentle voice of God amid the thunder must draw them. Shall the story of His wondrous love fail to touch some of you, my brethren? Is it nothing that the Son of God thought it worth while to leave the Father's glory to come and rescue men from that dread wrath to come? Think *from* what Jesus saves His people! think *to* what He saves them! then surely, if not before, you will now begin to value the great salvation. So, while accepting the revelation concerning a place of torment, you will read your title clear to a place prepared for you by the Saviour in the many mansions of the Father's House. You will not be like the guilty Colonel Charteris who, on his death-bed exclaimed, "I would gladly give £30,000 to have it proved to my satisfaction that there is no such place as hell;" but your language of holy exultation will be that of the Apostle, "Being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him" (Rom. v. 9).

NOTE.—In preparing this sermon for the Pulpit, the article on "Tophet," in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," and also the Rev. R. B. Girdlestone's "Dies Iræ" were found most helpful.

THE CIRCUMCISION OF CHRIST AND NEW YEAR'S DAY.

BY THE REV. JAMES A. CARR, LL.D., VICAR OF WHITECHURCH, DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED IN WHITECHURCH CHURCH ON JANUARY 1ST, 1890.

"For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God."—ROM. ii. 28, 29.

TO-DAY is the Feast of the Circumcision in the Church's year, and it is also the first day of a new year in our secular division of time. Our thoughts are naturally divided between these two circumstances when we meet for divine worship on this day. We cannot forget the great Christian event commemorated when God made "His blessed Son to be circumcised and obedient to the law for man;" and the fact that a new and untried portion of time is now opening upon us solemnises our minds in another direction.

These divisions of time are more or less artificial, but there is no less reason on this account to take a serious view of the fact that, for all practical purposes, we have entered on a fresh lease of this, our earthly life as it is measured out to us by successive years. God, we are told in the beginning of the Bible, when He created them, intended the heavenly bodies to be for "signs and for seasons and for days and years." And so it comes to pass that the revolution of the earth round the sun gives us a year, and the revolution of the moon round the earth gives us a month, and the revolution of the earth round its own axis gives us the twenty-four hours that make up a day and a night.

The entrance on a new year, then, has something very solemn about it, since our lives are made up of these separate years. If we know not what a day may bring forth, much less do we know what a year will bring forth, and now we are entering on a new year of grace, 1890.

What a suggestive expression is this when we think of it, *the year of grace!* The time of grace, the time of God's loving mercy towards mankind, commenced in a special way when our Saviour was born into the world. It was the beginning of the reign of grace; and the beginning of the dispensation under which we are now living; not a dispensation of fear and terror, and alarm, and distance from God, but one of love, of trust, of mutual communion, of adoption and sonship, whereby we cry "Abba, Father." This is the meaning of the expression "year of grace." May it be a year for each one of us wherein we shall learn something more of God's grace towards us, and have larger, freer, fuller, and more intelligent communion with him as our God and Father in Jesus Christ!

Now this is one way of looking at this day and thinking of it, but the Church puts another thought before us. It keeps this day as a holy day in remembrance that on it first Jesus Christ, our Blessed Lord and Saviour, while still but an infant of eight days old, suffered for the sins of the world. Our Lord's whole life was expiatory for sin, all His sufferings were in consequence of human transgression, and they were only completely filled up by His death and blood-shedding on the Cross.

Our Lord's circumcision was the commencement of His dedication to this work of substitutionary suffering for others. He was circumcised and made obedient to the law for man. And thus, when on the eighth day He received His name, He was called "Jesus," thus associating His sorrows and His sufferings with His atoning sacrifice—"Jesus," "for He shall save His people from their sins."

And beautifully does the Collect for to-day draw out the spiritual element in the event we commemorate when it asks for us "the true circumcision of the spirit, that our hearts and all our members being mortified from all worldly and carnal lusts, we may in all things obey God's blessed will, through the same His Son Jesus Christ our Lord."

If I were asked, then, to say what is the special grace we are to seek for this day, I would say it is *inwardness*—a grace, indeed, that embraces all the rest. "He is a Jew," says the Apostle, that is to

say, a true Israelite, a genuine believer, a sincere Christian ,"which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." This was no new doctrine of the Apostle, it was the promise of God to the Israelites in the last days: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." And, corresponding with this spiritual aspect of circumcision, St. Paul writes to the Philippian Christians: "We are the circumcision who worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."

Now circumcision has no place in the Christian Church, but another rite has taken its place. Baptism is to us what circumcision was to the Jews; it places us in covenant with God, but it is subject to exactly the same restrictions as to the spiritual blessings. It has a deep moral significance in that it signifies to the person baptised that he must cut off and cast away all evil lusts. Mere outward baptism is nothing, yea, rather, it is worse than nothing; it is a witness against us, if its fruits are not realised in our lives, by "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness."

Is the outward rite, then, to be neglected or made light of because the Apostle lays it down as a principle here that the analogous rite in Old Testament times, circumcision, is not that which is outward in the flesh? Certainly not. For suppose that St. Paul had heard of a Jew who, before the time of Christ or the preaching of the Gospel, had refused to circumcise his child on the ground that circumcision was that of the heart, and the circumcision of the flesh was therefore needless, or obsolete or unspiritual, what would he have said? Would he not have said that such a temper of mind, such a view of the divine ordinance was utterly godless, rationalistic, and profane? Would he not have said, "By such a refusal to circumcise your child you exalt yourself against God, you pretend that you are wiser and better than God, and you proudly and ignorantly reject, on behalf of your child, the covenant of his love?" And the same argument is equally true of baptism, which the Church has universally regarded as the Christian rite, which has taken the place of circumcision, as the Lord's Supper has taken the place of the Passover Supper.

But let me now recall your minds to the great grace set before us in the text, the grace of inwardness. "He is a Jew," that is to say, a true Israelite a child of God, "which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." This is what we are to seek for and cultivate above everything else, heart religion—this grace of inwardness, the spiritual, the hidden life which is fed by prayer, meditation, the reading of Holy Scripture, and attendance at the Lord's Table. Amid the many distractions of the coming year, its cares, anxieties, and worries, do seek to cultivate this higher life, do set apart moments for communion with God, with which you will allow nothing to interfere. Hear Him say to you, "Seek ye My face;" and let the response of your hearts be this: "Thy face, Lord, will I seek." In the multitude of your thoughts within you let His mercies delight your souls. Feed your hearts in the green pastures of His word and beside the still waters of His promises. Let this word abide with you—inwardness, the inwardness, the growth, the strength of the spiritual life, with which you will allow nothing to interfere. Troubles and anxieties, more or less, we shall have through the coming year—

> "There are thorns besetting every path
> Which call for constant care;
> There is a cross in every lot,
> And an earnest need for prayer.
> But a lowly heart that leans on Thee
> Is happy everywhere."

A NEW departure, says the *Church Review*, was taken at the Hospital Chapel-of-ease, High-street, Ilford, on Sunday week, when the infant son of the Rev. L. T. Terry, who is at present assisting the incumbent, was baptised by immersion. It is remarkable that there is no record or tradition of any public administration of Holy Baptism having ever taken place within its walls, although consecrated for Divine worship as far back as 1140. The service was chorally rendered by a full choir, and the procession to the western entrance was headed by a splendid crucifix. On receiving his son from from the godparents, the Rev. L. T. Terry, who officiated, immersed him thrice in the font, according to ancient usage. On the return to the chancel the incumbent (the Rev. A. Ingleby) preached on the unwonted event, and showed from the rubrics of the Prayer-book that the English Church enjoined immersion, save only in the case of delicate health. In future it will be the rule at this chapel that all public baptisms shall be by immersion only, the exceptions being taken privately.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1890.

DIFFICULT PARISHES.

ONE of the chief gains which we must confess would result from Disestablishment, should it ever take place, is the increased facilities which will be given to ecclesiastical authorities to meet the special requirements of parishes which are in need of sustained external help. An ordinary parish, with its admixture of rich and poor, or at least with that most liberal class of persons, the middle-class men, is always capable of meeting all the ordinary requirements and all the reasonable financial strain put upon it. Its schools, mission house, lay and clerical agents, publications, teas, soup kitchens, etc., must be kept up, and the relief to the sick and deserving poor must never become less. The absolute requirements of, and many details which are the result of local conditions have to be carefully nursed and supported. All this costs money, and in most instances has necessarily to be raised from the parishioners only. This in nearly every case is only just and fair, and we cannot but acknowledge that in these parishes funds are almost universally forthcoming. This state of affairs however, does not represent the English parochial system in its entirety. Many parishes, we fear, would have to take exception to the general conditions we have just laid down, and *they* most of all are in need of some organisation for supplying necessary wants, which their own internal resources are utterly inadequate to meet—such parishes as Spitalfields, for instance, where in the very midst of the most desperate portion of the terrible East End it is necessary to keep ever blazing the fire of Church enthusiasm. All the agencies and conditions found useful in other parishes need to be maintained in such a neighbourhood, and, in addition to all that is usual, the very peculiarities of such districts demand additional organisation. But where are the means to come from to supply all the deficiencies? Take, for instance, the parish alluded to—a parish of 21,000 souls, with practically no one to relieve the constant monotony of absolute poverty, with more drains upon its resources than any ordinary, and perhaps any parish in England. Or, again, in the case of some of those poor country districts, where poverty of parson and people is the most noticeable characteristic of the place, how can it be possible, under existing conditions, to maintain the high standard of efficient parochial work which is essential to the true dignity of the Church of England?

We cannot but feel the absolute need there is for some method which shall be able to meet the existing need by a more equitable distribution of Church moneys. Rich parishes do often try to help poorer ones, but often the parishes they help are the wrong ones; and it is, therefore, essential that such action should be guided by some person or persons who are thoroughly conversant with the needs of the district. For instance, only quite recently a rich West-End congregation attached themselves to a Whitechapel parish, bringing with them sufficient funds and help of various descriptions to meet the entire demands of any ordinary parish, and yet all the time the General Purpose Fund alone had reached the unparalleled sum of over £1,100, whilst the Relief Account was considerably in excess of £500. We take this merely as an example to show how necessary it is that some regulating power should exist to bring about a fairer distribution of the aid so needed in parishes of special difficulty.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

HEB. ii. 9. JOHN xii. 32. 1 COR. xv. 22. 28.

SIR,—When a person pushes the principles of "J.B." to their legitimate issue, he replies by saying you are under a "misconception:" forgetting apparently, that the "misconception" is entirely on his own part, that the "beam" is altogether in "his own eye." He has not yet returned an answer to the enquiry "Why should a man go to hell?" Under what necessity is any human being to go there; seeing that Christ is able to save "unto the uttermost" all that come unto God through Him *now?* The statement that a man may go to hell and suffer "age-long" torment, as a preparatory step towards heaven is fraught with folly and madness; and could not proceed from an All-wise God; nor be presented by Him for acceptance to human intelligence; when He has already devised a plan with the special purpose of saving man from that bitter experience. "*Why* will ye die, O house of Israel?" Is it because there "is no balm in Gilead?" Is it because "there is no Physician there?"

This consideration, to a mind blessed with the common sense of an ordinary mortal, would be a conclusive *à priori* argument that such a notion would not be found in any of the texts at the head of this letter. Whatever they may particularly mean, it is evident that they do not include the "whole intelligent creation," because there is nothing hinted or said about the devil. Man is the subject spoken of in each of them. "Christ tasted death for every *man*." "I will draw all *men* unto me; for as in Adam all (men) die, so in Christ shall all (men) be made alive." "God shall be all, in all" those who shall have been saved from among men.

But let us look at them particularly. First principles must be understood as implied, when not expressly mentioned, in every proposition concerning the objects of any science. Thus, for instance, your friend tells you that he went down the river in a boat last evening; you are anxious to know how he went down, and you ask him if he rowed, or used the sails. He tells you that he used the sails. This is all the answer he gives you: but at the same time he gives you credit for the common sense to know that the sails by *themselves*, without the *wind*, could not have taken him down. The wind was a *prime motor* in the matter which he naturally expected your intelligence to supply. In the same way: When we find it clearly laid down in Scripture that we "are saved by *faith* in Christ," we must always bear in mind that faith is regarded as a *sine quâ non* when salvation is spoken of, though that faith may not be expressly mentioned. Hence, when it is said that "Christ tasted death for every man," the instrumentality of faith is implied as necessary in order to appropriate the personal benefit secured by His death. And that the apostle did not mean to exclude faith is evident from his laying it down as a fundamental principle of Christian salvation that "without faith it is impossible to *please* God." He warns the Hebrews against the "evil heart of unbelief," and exhorts them not to be of "those who draw back to *perdition*, but of them who *believe* to the *saving* of the soul." The promise of "eternal life is to whomsoever believeth." Now we know that many die in unbelief and so perish endlessly; because the "wrath of God *abideth* on him that believeth not;" and it is not possible for anyone in hell to believe in order to obtain salvation, because their unhappy lot is to "drink wrath *without mixture*" out of the cup of God's indignation "for ever and ever."

A remark similar to the above is applicable to John xii. 32. "Christ draws all men to Him" in order to be saved; but this "drawing" is the drawing of repentance and faith; and where these two qualities are not exercised there is no salvation. Accordingly, He himself said on one occasion, "Ye will not come unto me (by repentance and faith) in order that ye might have life." And this latter quotation teaches us that God will not "apply" by any forcible or mechanical "process," or in a manner independent of the affections, will, and understanding, his salvation on any person. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." Consequently it is difficult to see how universalism can be gathered out of these two texts.

It is admitted that the language in 1 Cor. xv. 22 refers to the Resurrection; but then the remark is added that "if all be raised it will be for objects beneficial to all." If we compare this with our Lord's statement in John v. 29, we shall see how groundless it is. "And shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life*; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Could any terms be more opposed? Is "damnation" a "beneficial thing? Are the "shame and everlasting contempt," in Daniel xii. 2 the "tribulation and anguish, the indignation and wrath," in Rom. ii. 9; the "cup of indignation filled with *wrath without mixture*; are all these "beneficial objects?" It is painful to reflect on the unhappy constitution of that mind which can read out of plain texts of scripture things so utterly opposed to their spirit and meaning. It would be an important psychological problem to find out the cause of this sad mental distortion. One element in it perhaps is the inability or indisposition to admit properly the infinite demerit of sin; the awful wrong done to the infinite Majesty of God in breaking His law. Another perhaps would be the disposition to confound the love of God in God, with the *sinful sympathy for sin* which men sometimes find in themselves, and which they imagine to be christian sympathy with the sinner. Another is the disposition to resolve all the attributes of God into one: into His love; just as if from that love did not spring His "jealousy" for His own honour; His infinite hatred of sin, and His disposition to punish it in accordance with its demerit.

The meaning of 1 Cor. xv. 28 is simply that "when the administration of the Kingdom of Grace is finally closed; when there shall be no longer any state of probation, and consequently no longer need of a distinction between the Kingdom of Grace and the Kingdom of Glory; then the Son as being man, and the Messiah shall cease to exercise any distinct dominion. This shall be when the "Son shall have gathered out of His Kingdom all things that offend; when "all whose names were not written in the book of Life shall have been cast into the lake of fire," together with "the devil." This is the last that we hear of these people; this is the essence of the irrevocable sentence "Depart from Me." Revelation closes over this scene, and it is too late in the day for "J. B." or anyone else to try to supplement it, by claiming the gift of vaticination, so as to tell us how, or when, they shall get out of the lake of fire. The only "momentous process mentioned is that of being *tormented for ever and ever*.

R. DONALDSON.

January 22nd, 1890.

SIR,—According to the opinion of all commentators and of those also who read the book intelligently, the Apocalypse is the description of the vision of St. John, to whom were shown things that should shortly come to pass, in and under the forms of allegories and figures. The things that were shortly to come to pass were spiritual states of the world, or political states, or spiritual and political states. They were shown in a series of visions, connected, we may not doubt, but the connection not shown throughout very apparently in the account of the visions. In the 13th and 15th chapters of the Revelation there is given the description of the rising from the sea of a great and wicked beast, who should make subjects of many persons; and should impose on them to have a mark as belonging to him. What this means or foreshadows is still, in this late period of time, matter of dispute; or, more properly, matter of contemplation, to those who examine St. John's prophecy. We are told (chapter xiv. 9—11) that this beast's subjects shall be subjected to a special curse.

This being so, it is a matter of wonder to me, who

suppose Mr. Donaldson, your correspondent, to be a person acquainted with the Scriptures of Truth, that he should, as he does in his letter to you of the 18th inst., identify those who receive the mark of the Beast 666 with "the wicked." It is quite evident that the Revelation of St. John is concerning things that are to come to pass on this earth ; and it is quite evident, from the whole purpose of the prophecy, that what is prophesied in the 14th chapter does describe some spiritual or political condition that has yet to arise on this earth. Unless—and I here speak with doubt and reserve—the intention of this great prophecy be to announce and declare, not future events, but principles by which we are to interpret events. In any case, we should (I think) understand the prophecy as having allusion to events on the earth.

If so—and if I am mistaken,—I don't think I can be shown to be without doubt mistaken—I don't think that the contrary to what I say can be absolutely established—to speak of the denunciation of the followers of the Beast 666 as a denunciation in general of the wicked, is utterly contrary to the Scripture. Mr. Donaldson, without any reason, assumes that Rev. chapter xiv. verse 11, which speaks of the smoke of the torment of those who have the mark of that Beast, 666, ascending up for ever and ever, does condemn or does announce the condemnation of, after this manner, all wicked and unrepentant persons. He refers to Rev. xx. verse 10, in which the devil, the Beast and the false prophet, certainly not persons as he and I are, but figurative persons or figures, are cast into the burning lake, as confirmation of his view ; most illogically.

Can he tell, or can I tell, of unfulfilled prophecy, what it means ? These are things that have not happened yet. It is very plain that they have reference to what will happen in the spiritual world, or in the political world, on this earth, unless, as said above, they refer to principles ; in which case, reasoning, from the declarations respecting them, to the final condition of the unrepenting, becomes the more absurd.

Mr. Donaldson speaks of plain texts of Scripture. The texts that he cites, or those above, and Romans, chapter ii., verses 3—9, may be plain to him. But this last, which speaks of wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, does not speak of everlasting wrath, etc., as he assumes that it does. I do not argue against the doctrine of everlasting punishment. I am in ignorance of the subject. I believe that it is (wisely, by the ordering of God) concealed from us what the future state of the unrepenting shall be. But I am offended—yes, disgusted,—with the assertiveness—may I say positiveness ?—with which persons who have no business declare that God has determined to relegate to everlasting wretchedness all persons who do not repent of their sins in this earthly life. Mr. Donaldson, in his zeal for this doctrine (doctrine shall I call it—or mania ?) speaks of people being cast into a place where there will be no Holy Ghost to remonstrate with them about their sins and their condition. Has he read the 7th verse of the 139th Psalm ? Does he imagine, can he imagine, a place where God is not ? I say again, I know not where these thoughts lead to.

I must reflect in the same spirit on the letter of your correspondent, Mr. Walker. He cites six texts, of which he asks, Is there in any of them a word that implies that punishment in the next life has no end ? To which I reply, that there is only one of them, Matt. chap. xxv., verse 46, that implies that it has none. What does he mean — what is meant by *Gehenna ?* When he quotes what he intends to be the Scripture, he ought to be correct, and his quotations should have some appositeness. To quote an inopportune remark from the Book of Ecclesiastes on the subject is really too much, were it not that to quote "There is no repentance in the grave" is neither Scripture nor anything else. I assure your correspondent that in offering these observations I do not want to damn anyone. How could what I say, or what others say, damn people ? Damn means condemn. I am really tired of him and others "intruding into those things which they have not seen." I think of the poet who rendered the Old Testament into rhyme, and, according to Swift,

> Undid Creation at a jerk,
> And of Salvation made damn'd work.

B.

23rd January.

"PERFECTLY ABSURD."

SIR,—It is a pity that Mr. Sandlands is in such haste to launch his thunderbolts, as to have no time to see what the object of his attack really is. In the present case the result is, that it is merely a phantom of his own creation that he is bent on demolishing. He will insist on making "J. B." say that all men without exception are prepared for immortality in a *future life ;* and therefore none in the present life ; and it is upon this imaginary statement that his ridicule and invective are poured out. Yet, a moment's intelligent examination will show that "J. B." is entirely innocent of the statement.

What he wrote, as correctly quoted by Mr. Sandlands in a former letter, expresses the conviction that it is the purpose of God "to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, holy and happy immortality through processes of a most momentous nature, which take place during *aions or ages.*" Having quoted this, Mr. Sandlands immediately substitutes for the latter half of it the phrase, "by a special process *after this life,*" thus introducing a totally new limitation. In his last letter Mr. Sandlands repeats this unwarranted alteration, and charges "J. B." with saying that "all men were to be made happy by some process or processes *after death.*" The state of the case is therefore this : That Mr. Sandlands spends three letters on demonstrating the absurdity of a statement which he himself has made absurd by foisting into it the alien phrases "after this life," "after death." In brief, "J. B." says that the saving process goes on during the ages ; Mr. Sandlands hastily assumes that all these ages are subsequent to the present dispensation or life in the world, and fastens on "J. B." the absurdity of denying that any men find salvation in the present life.

Surely Mr. Sandlands must be aware that among the *aions* of which the New Testament speaks the present dispensation is numbered. As there was an *aion* of Judaism which terminated with the fall of the temple, so there is an *aion* of the Kingdom of Heaven and the Gospel in which we live, and there are others to follow. It has been through carelessly overlooking the fact that "J. B's." phrase covers all these *aions,* that Mr. Sandlands has been betrayed into accusing it of absurdity.

As I am writing, may I venture to hope that your readers may be spared the infliction of a series of

exegetical letters from the writer who signs himself "R. Donaldson." A commentator who treats the two noble texts, Eph. i. 10 and Col. i. 20, by giving an impossible translation of one, interpolating the other, and incredibly debasing both, cannot be taken seriously; and although the pain of seeing Scripture so abused may possibly be alleviated by the ludicrousness of the treatment, edification and instruction are out of the question. To imagine that St. Paul, when sweeping with his eagle glance the heaven and the earth, the whole creation of God, and exulting in the divine purpose to "recapitulate" the whole in Christ, should have merely meant that some should be saved out of both the governing and governed classes among Jews and Gentiles—is really to father upon inspiration an unutterable bathos.

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—I have given a reply, to the best of my ability, to the question raised by "*Inquirens*," and have given my authority, viz: our Lord Christ's words, as contained in St. John 6th chapter. Your correspondent now tries to narrow the question raised, and says that all else (other I suppose he means than is contained in his few words) is beside the question and does not touch the real point. I will not discuss the subject on these lines.

In to-day's paper, Mr. Sandlands asks "J. B." to name any "universalist" writer who regards Our Lord's Atonement as the foundation of the Christian hope. The question is answered in the next column, by Mr. Murphy,—a not undistinguished writer—and the name of Mr. Erskine of Linlathen—a still better known writer—at once occurs to me. I am not a Universalist, but am free to say that there is much in the works of the above authors that is very admirable.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

25th January.

CANON HOSTE, rector of Farnham, became suddenly indisposed whilst reading the Commandments at St. James's, Farnham, on Sunday morning, when he announced to the congregation that he could proceed no further, and at once pronounced the Benediction and left the Church.

WE regret to learn from the *Record* that the Rev. B. Baring-Gould has met with an accident, and broken his arm.

THE Rev. D. Schofield, who seceded from the Primitive Methodists has been appointed to a curacy in connection with St. Thomas's, Liverpool.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Berens, Rev. G., B.A., East London Clergyman.
Blunt, Rev. A. C., M.A., Rural Dean of Andover (N. Division.)
Browne, Rev. S. S., Rector of North Cove, Suffolk.
Cavanagh, Rev. John, Chaplain to the *Triumph*.
Cooper, Rev. Henry William, Rector of Woodham Mortimer, Essex.
Cowley, Rev. H. G. B., Chaplain, Bengal.
Edwards, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bradford; 13th Honorary Canon in Ripon Cathedral.
Egremont, Rev. H. E., B.A., Vicar of St. James's, Milton, Hants.
Firth, Rev. E. H., Curate of St. Agnes's, Bristol; Rector of Micheldean, Gloucestershire.
Fisher, Rev. Cecil Edward, M.A., Canon of Lincoln, Rector of Hagworthing; Vicar of St. Peter's Bournemouth.
Forrest-Bell, Rev. J. H., Assistant Priest of All Saints', Newton Stewart, and St. John's Mission, Stranraer; Priest-in-Charge of St. John's Mission, Stranraer.
Garwood, Rev. George Frederick, Priest-in-Charge of Holy Trinity Mission, Motherwell; Incumbent of St. Michael's, Govan.
Goffe, Rev. H. F., Rector of Thorganby and Vicar of Thoresway, Lincolnshire.
Gray, Rev. Edward Ker, LL.D., Minister of St. George's Chapel, Albemarle Street; Lecturer of the Parish Church of St. Mary's, Stratford, Bow.
Gresham, Rev. G. F. S., B.A., East London Clergyman.
Griffiths, Rev. John, formerly Incumbent of Cwmavon, Rector of Bedwas-with-Rudry, Cardiff.
Hall, Rev. Stuart, Curate of Longmarton, near Appleby; Incumbent of Rothesay, in the Isle of Bute.
Hayman, Rev. Matthew Henry, to Dendron, Lancashire.
Mortimer, Rev. Christian, M.A., Rector of Pitchford, Shrewsbury; Residentiary Canon and Precentor of Lichfield Cathedral.
Mylius, Rev. John B., M.A., Senior Curate of All Saints', Hatcham Park; Rector of Elmdon, Warwickshire.
Nevile, Rev. C. S., B.A., Rector of Wickenby, Lincolnshire.
Pearson, Rev. William, Vicar of Shipley, Yorkshire; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Bolton.
Price, Rev. E., B.A., Vicar of Braceby, near Folkingham.
Pullen, Rev. Alfred Trask, B.A., Rector of Tintern Parva, Monmouthshire.
Roberts, Rev. Robert H., Curate of Great Houghton, Northampton; Rector of Harpham-with-Upton-cum-Kexby, Lincolnshire.
Seymour, Rev. A. E., M.A., Vicar of Chittlehampton.
Slade, Rev., Vicar of Thorley, Isle of Wight.
Ventris, Rev. Edward F., M.A., Rector of St. Andrew's, Aston, Newport, Salop; Vicar of Arthington, Leeds.
Warburton, Rev. Canon W. P., M.A., Rural Dean of Winchester.
Wayne, Rev. W. H. F., Curate of St. Neot's, Cornwall; Vicar of Sheldon, near Honiton.
Wilkinson, Rev. W., Curate of the Albert Memorial Church; Clerical Secretary of the Ripon Diocesan Church of England Temperance Society.
Wood, Rev. H. T., M.A., Vicar of Biggleswade, Beds.; Vicar of Aldbury, Herts.
Woosnam, Rev. Charles Maxwell, M.A., Rector of Kirkby-Wiske-with-Maunby; Missions to Seamen Chaplain on the Mersey.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Battye, Rev. W. Wilberforce, of Tingrith House, Beds, and Little Hampden, Bucks, forty years Rector of Hever, at Hever Rectory, Kent, on the 24th ult., aged 67.

Butler, Rev. William, M.A., ex-Rector of Padworth, Berks, and formerly Head Master of the Nottingham Grammar School, at 13, Victoria Square, Reading, on the 15th ult., aged 79.

Dalton, Rev. Joseph Bardgett, M.A., formerly Vicar of St. James's Whitehaven, of Holmfield, Darley Dale, on the 18th ult., aged 47.

Duke, Rev. William Thwaites, B.A., C.C.C., Camb., Rector of Longfield, Kent, at Lepatines, Rio Pureis, Amazonas, Brazil, on the 29th ult.

Fagan, Rev. H. S., M.A., late Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Rector of the parish, at Great Cressingham Rectory, Norfolk, on the 24th ult., aged 63.

Kemp, Rev. Augustus Kemp, on the 23rd ult., aged 74.

Smith, Rev. Henry Francis, M.A., Rector of Folke, on the 19th ult.

Wall, Rev. Charles Joseph, M.A., late Rector of Sproatley, Hull, for thirty-eight years Rural Dean of Hedon, J.P., at Scarborough, on the 25th ult., aged 66.

Waterhouse, Rev. Charles James, M.A., late Senior Chaplain H.M.'s Indian Service, at 73, Leamington Terrace, Edinburgh, on the 19th ult., aged 63.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRIST'S LAST CHARGE.

By the Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached on behalf of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, December 28th, 1889.

"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations."—Matthew xxviii. 18, 19.

A REFERENCE to our Lord's great charge to His disciples can hardly fail to be welcome on a day like this, for the words furnish the warrant for that solemn scene which has taken place in this Cathedral this morning, when the chief pastor of this diocese, exercising the most solemn prerogative of his high office, has admitted a number of young men to lower and higher degrees in the ministry of the Church of God. Moreover, the words encourage and invigorate that desire for the extension of Christ's kingdom as a constant precedent to His second coming in glory which is so natural—nay, may it not be said, so inevitable?—a feeling in every Christian soul. Across the triumphs and the failures of well-nigh nineteen centuries the spiritual ear still catches the accents of the charge on the mountain of Galilee, and as we listen we note that neither lapse of time nor change of circumstances have ever impaired their solemn and enduring force: "Make disciples of all the nations." This precept—which, if it ever had binding virtue, must have it this moment for all who believe in the Divine Speaker's right to impose it—must bind you and me as distinctively and as constrainingly as His disciples. And what a precept it is! "Go, make disciples of all the nations." Of all the nations! Not only of the race of Israel, who have ancient writings, prophecies, and revelations that will make your work comparatively easy; not only of the Semitic race, which will at least understand the manner, the temper, and power of the Prophet of Nazareth; not only of the civilised nations of the world, in which law and order and the courtesies of social life and speculations on the great problems of existence may be expected to welcome the influence that will so powerfully assist and reinforce them; not of the great Roman world alone; not only of the race of mankind which is now within our reach—"all the nations!" No race of man has not a claim on you, however remote, degraded, fierce, repulsive it may be; you are debtors to the Greeks and the barbarians, to the well-to-do, to the poor, to the accomplished and to the very ignorant, for you bear in your hearts and hands that which all need; you are the ambassadors of a charity which knows no distinctions between the claims on its bounty, and no frontiers save those of the race of man.

And such a precept implies, among other things, that there was a grave necessity for imposing and obeying it. For let us suppose—it is a dreadful supposition for a Christian to suggest, but I put it in order to clear the ground—let us suppose that the religion taught by our Lord was of purely human origin, a natural product of the human mind in a particular set of circumstances at a given stage of its development. In that case, what would have been the justification of an attempt to impose it on the human race! How could a mere outgrowth—or, if you please, manufacture—of one human mind or set of human minds be imposed upon all others without intolerabe impertinence and pretensions? Would not other men also have thought that they, too, could give or could create a religion better suited to themselves, and better calculated to meet their wants? "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?" This is the natural language of the human soul warmly attached to the traditions of family and country, and yet not conscious of being face to face with a creed that alone has come from God. Certainly when a religion claims the attention and the allegiance of the race of man, it does claim by implication to have come from God.

And before our Lord desired His disciples to "make disciples of all the nations," He had been already declared the Son of God with power, so far as His higher holy nature was concerned, by the resurrection from the dead. But His command was further based on two motives of commanding power—the first, the needs of human beings. On all matters of the first importance they lived in a mental darkness, the gloom of which was scarcely relieved by the fitful light here and there of some speculated philosophy; their affections were given to objects which were constantly unworthy and degrading; their wills were so warped and weakened that not seldom in the midst of the very highest culture they lost all sense of moral law. Those who have read through the Dialogues of Plato, and who have studied the life, and not merely the teaching, of Socrates, will understand the completeness of the moral failure of heathenism even at its very best. What it was elsewhere can too easily be imagined. What it is at this moment we may learn, for instance, from recent accounts of the condition of Central Africa, or from the instructive narrative of his four years' life amongst the aborigines of Queensland in Australia which has lately been given to the world by the Norwegian traveller,

Lemholtz. Without Christ the world lay of old, and it lies now, in darkness—darkness intellectual and moral, in the shadow of death.

And thus a second motive for the precept was found in what our Lord had proposed to do, or had already done, for man; as the Light of the world He illumined its darkness with clear and definite teaching about God, about sin, about eternity; as the Mediator between God and man He expiated on the cross the sins which had estranged men from God; as the Model and the Author of a new life in man, purifying his heart and invigorating his soul, He sent His Spirit to secure to man, both otherwise and especially through assigned channels such as the sacraments, such contact with His perfect humanity as should enable all human beings to put on that new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. The source of all this was the self-humiliation of Him who, being in the form of God, did not deem His equality with God a prize to be jealously clutched at, "but emptied Himself of His glory, and took on Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." That gift of Himself by the Eternal Son is the true secret of missionary as of all other effort in the Church of Christ. If He has done this for man, what can I do for Him? is the question which the Christian soul is constantly asking itself. It anticipates the precept: "Make disciples of all nations." Indeed, my brethren, it is not too much to say that an interest in promoting obedience to our Lord's commands, "Go, make disciples of all the nations," is a fair test of the genuineness of a man's faith in Jesus Christ. There are many forms of Christian activity good and useful in themselves, and warmly approving themselves to good men, as to which it would be quite exaggeration to say as much as this. A man may be a believer in our Lord without taking interest in a great many questions of Biblical criticism, of the relation between Christianity and physical science or social questions; it is otherwise with the extension of our Lord's kingdom among men. A good Christian cannot be other than eager on that subject. Not only his sense of what is due to the Lord who bought him, but also his natural sense of justice, his intimate persuasion that he has no right to monopolise, to withold from others the privileges, the prospects which are the joy of his inmost life; when he finds virtue in the power of prayer, when he looks forward with humble confidence to death, when he enjoys the blessed gift of inward peace between the soul and its God—peace between the soul's various powers and faculties—he cannot but ask himself the question, "Do I not owe it to the millions who have no part in these priceless blessings that I should do what I can myself, or through others, to extend to them a share in this smile of the Universal Father which is the joy and the consolation of my life? Can I possibly neglect the command to help in the work of making disciples of all the nations?"

But if the duty thus enjoined is a necessary, it is also a difficult one. A serious conviction of long standing on any subject lodged in any human mind is not easily displaced in favour of a new one; and religious convictions, however fallen and degraded may be the religion to which they belong, are displaced with greater difficulty than any other convictions. They strike their roots deeper into the texture of the soul; they are bound up, as are no others, with the great events of life, with the sense of duty to home and country—above all, with the memory of the dead. Those who have passed away have professed that creed; they have practised those rites; they have enjoined, it may be with a dying breath, loyal adherence to them on the son or daughter who is now asked to exchange them for another faith. It is impossible to refuse a certain sort of sympathy to some of the inferior specimens of the lowest adherents of Paganism in the old Roman world. Men who lived when the victory of Christianity was already ascertained, and who clung with a courage worthy of a better cause to the old superstitions—men like Symmachus, struggling to retain the traditional association of the Senate with the ancient religion of the Empire, or, like Marcellinus, retiring to his Dalmatian home to mourn a change which was no longer in his power to avert. Wrong as these men were in their aim, and false as we Christians know was their creed, they still represent the loyalty of the human soul to influences which powerfully sway the heart and the conscience. The forces which are ranged against the ambassador of truth are by no means all of them bad. Some of them are amongst the stoutest allies of his creed: reverence for the past, love of the departed, the natural feelings of gratitude, the prompting not only of affectionateness but that self-distrust which requires not so much change, as our capacity to measure the value of change. And, furthermore, every old religion represents and is linked to a vast mass of vested interests, and these, irrespectively of the truth or falsehood of the religion, are strenuously opposed to the advocates of change. Many of these interests have, properly speaking, nothing to do with religion itself—they are of a purely material character; but an instinct of self-preservation leads them to associate themselves with the religion which supports them, and to take its part when it appears to be threatened.

You will remember how through St. Paul's mission at Ephesus the jewellers round the great Temple of the Goddess Diana saw what would follow on the success of the Apostle; "a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the

craftsmen, whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth; moreover ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands. So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought, but also that the temple of the great Goddess Diana should be despised and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth." And indeed this or a kindred motive would have influenced some of the better Roman Emperors who lent their wealth and their hands to the bad work of persecuting the Church of Christ; they saw in Christianity a force which threatened the existing order of things with serious change and dislocation, and they apprehended that this meant weakness and perhaps ruin for the great political and social system over which they presided. They did not see far enough to discern beyond the horizon an imminent change; they did not perceive—how should they?—that even in the things of this world the religion of our Lord has a much greater constructive force than any other; that if you give it time it will more than replace whatever it may have removed. This missionary effort always has to reckon with the alarm and opposition of a respectable but mistaken kind of conservatism, to say nothing of the mass of baser passions which are permanently ranged against any setting forth of the righteousness of God.

The difficulties of the Christian missionary are always and inevitably great, and the sense of their magnitude has at times betrayed portions of the great Church of Christ into the employment of illegitimate means of extending our Lord's kingdom. Of these, the first is the method of force. Why should you not oblige people to do and to be, so men have reasoned, that which, after all, is for their truest benefit? Mere savages do not—they cannot—understand an argument. Your appeals to the moral sense, to the presumptions which arise from the nature of God, and to the history of the origin of Christianity, are lost upon them. You had better treat them like children. A child is managed by the application of force until he is old enough to understand the obligation of principle. Did not the Most Merciful say in one of His parables, "Compel them to come in, that My house may be filled;" and is it not a mistaken delicacy, doomed by anticipation to failure, to deal with these grown-up children as if they were thoughtful men, open to the force of facts and persuasion? Is it not better to exert a little violence for which unborn generations will bless your name? So reasoned Charlemagne or the advisers who accompanied him, as his great armies advanced across the Rhine to the conquest of the Saxons in the year of our Lord 772. The Saxons, as you know, were the first cousins of our own ancestors, and history obliges us to admit that of all the barbarous races that peopled ancient Europe, none were more ferocious, none more attached to the brutalities of their ancestral religion, especially to the practice of human sacrifice, than they were. Before Charlemagne advanced, Levuen, a missionary born in England, but of Saxon blood, a man whose speech was well understood by his German kinsmen, appeared in the midst of a great Saxon Diet when the chiefs of the natives were engaged in an act of solemn worship and sacrifice, proclaimed himself the messenger of the one true God Who had made heaven and earth, denounced the folly and the impiety of the rites of which he was a witness, spoke of Jesus Christ and His redemption, and urged repentance, faith, and baptism. The Saxons listened for a while in silence, and then Levuen went on to say that unless they obeyed the heavenly message, God would send a mighty monarch from across the Rhine who would lay waste their land with fire and the sword, and reduce them to serfdom. The audience was at once roused to fury, and Levuen only escaped from a terrible death through the intervention of an aged chieftain. But Charlemagne came, as Levuen said he would come; he came once and again, and by no means always for purely religious reasons. Behind his great army of Franks there followed a band of Christian clergy, forbidden to bear arms, but resolved to exercise their ministry as soon as victory had declared for their master. The conquered Saxons accepted Christianity; they suffered, too, baptism as a condition of peace. A poet of a rather later age contemplates Charlemagne on the Day of Judgment as nearly associated with the Apostles themselves, while hosts of Saxon priests follow him within the gates of heaven; but the poet does not inquire how many of them had obeyed the persuasion not of the Christian missionary, but of the sword of the Frankish Emperor. But the method of force was an expedient of zealous men living in a rude age, anxious for results which require patience and time, impatient of delays and of resistance. In these days we are in no danger of adopting the method of force. There is no particular credit in our not doing so, since it is opposed in a dozen ways to the prevailing temper of the time. Had we lived in the eighth century we should probably have assisted, or, at least, obliged, Charlemagne. As it is, we too often fall back on another method, which is more congenial to a generation whose temptations lie in an opposite direction. This method is the method of concession. Instead of attempting to coerce human souls into conversion, the men of our day take great trouble to explain that conversion involves very little—only a very few new convictions, only a very slight change of life. We dwell at great length on that, exaggerating the amount of truth to be found in heathen religions; we attenuate as far as we

can the distinctive truths of the religion of Christ; the sterner sayings of our heart are thrown into the background or are explained away. He is presented as an easy-going benevolence, with no tangible quality of justice belonging to Him; sin is resolved into natural mistake or into an imperfect form of virtue; the Atonement into a higher kind of sympathy, the action of the Holy Spirit into an indefinite impulse towards good; the sacrament into graceful symbols of spiritual processes which may or may not take place within us; the Bible into a book of the highest interest; but not to be trusted as a depository of absolute truth. The definiteness, the severity, the awe, the mysteriousness of the old creed of Christendom disappears in this new presentation of it; and with this—let us be sure of it—there also disappears the unveiling of an infinite love and the putting forth of an irresistible attraction. After all, what has this attenuated Christianity to say to the heathen? If the man should have the heart to become a missionary on behalf of so thin a creed as this, it may be predicted that he will not do very much for the men to whom he addresses himself; the heart of heathendom would say to him: "If this be all that you have to bring us, why approach us at all? Why not stay at home, and leave us to make the best we can of our own twilight, without being distracted by yours.

And the third and better method is the method of self-sacrifice. It exerts no compulsion, except such as the message of God's love, illustrated by the life of His ambassadors, will always exert over thousands of human hearts; it makes no surrender of any part of the gracious message which it bears, remembering whose message it is. Its power in all ages lies in this, that it exhibits the love of the Redeemer at work in the lives and the efforts of the redeemed, and the double appeal of the message and the example surely does its work in time. This self-sacrifice has been displayed in willingly undertaking unwelcome duty, in willingly submitting to hardships and sufferings from which human nature shrinks. From the days of the Apostles to our own day, the annals of Christian missions have been the annals of Christian heroism. St. Paul's account of his own ministry has been again and again repeated, who exercised it, he says, "in much patience, in affliction, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labours, in watchings, in fastings." He describes himself as always bearing about on his body the dye of the Lord Jesus Christ, as having fellowship with Christ's sufferings, as filling up that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ; and this intimate association with Jesus Christ in His passion is the note and the temper of all true missionaries; and in not a few cases, as we know, the correspondence is carried out to the very last extremity. The spirit of self-sacrifice is shown, perhaps, more completely in a willingness after years of toil, to dispense, if it be God's will, with proofs of success. Our practical English temper prompts us to insist upon tangible results as a test of the value of spiritual work; but although such results are a blessing and an encouragement, for which, when they are given, a man may well thank God, yet their absence is by no means a proof that no real work has been done. The seed which is sown in one generation may take time to mature, and will only bear fruit in the next. Long before the Roman Empire became Christian, the air, so to speak, was filled with Christian ideas; the Christian creed was discussed and rediscussed by those who had not yet held it; and while stray conversions took place in all ranks of life, most of the people remained apparently attached to the old Paganism. In the middle of the third century not more than one-twentieth part of the population was Christian; in the next, the fourth, conversions came with a rush; the ground had now been prepared, the seed at last had taken root and sprung up. This may suggest encouragement to those of us who are disposed to complain, for example, of the slow progress which Christianity makes in India. The difficulties which India presents to the Christian Church are in some respects greater than any that were presented by the Paganism of old Rome; and the Church has not yet had in that country half the time that she took in order to conquer the mind and heart of the Roman Empire for Christ. She was at least two hundred and fifty years about that work, and we have not yet reached the date in our Indian missions which would correspond to the middle of the third century in the work of the Church within the Empire; and yet nearly twenty years ago Sir Bartle Frere could write that statistical facts in no way conveyed any idea of the work done in any part of India. "The effect," he says, "is often enormous where there has not been a single avowed conversion." And, again, the teaching of Christianity among the one hundred and sixty millions of civilised industrious Hindoos and Mahommedans in India has affected changes moral, social, and political which have extended rapidly, and the facts are far more extraordinary than we or our fathers have witnessed in modern Europe. These changes, do not let us be mistaken, are not conversions, but they are the preparation of the mental and moral state in which conversions take place. They show that we may hope for a progress not less certain, if not less rapid, than that of the Gospel of Christ among these countries of the West, which were the scenes of its first great victories. These and some kindred considerations were urged some years since with his wonted power in a paper comparing ancient and modern missions by a great prelate who has just passed from this earthly scene into the eternal world.

At a quarter to four o'clock yester-evening

service, in which his name was mentioned among the sick who desired the prayers of the Church, the Bishop of Durham died at Bournemouth. On the morrow of such an event it is difficult—it is impossible—to estimate its real significance. A Bishop's death must always be a solemn moment for the diocese over which he has presided, and, in a less emphatic sense, for the Church at large; but this general truth would give no adequate idea of the nature of the loss which has just been sustained. The withdrawal of such a mind as Bishop Lightfoot's, in days such as our own, is even more than a loss to the English Church; it is a loss to Christendom. If I put aside the regions of later ecclesiastical history which another Bishop, also formerly a member of this chapter, has made especially his own, Bishop Lightfoot was beyond dispute the most learned of living English prelates. He was one—is it wrong to say he was the leader?—of a band of Cambridge scholars who have rolled back an assault upon the New Testament more formidable, in many respects, than any to which the title-deeds of our holy religion have ever been exposed since the first age of Christianity. Years have now passed since he reached an eminence from which an expression of his opinion commanded the attention of learned Europe. His edition of the works of the martyr Bishop of Antioch, St. Ignatius, is probably the greatest monument of his own knowledge and labour, as it is certainly of recent English scholarship; it has extinguished controversies which a few years since were still active by a weight of learning, handled with an insight and ability from which, in these matters, there is no appeal. But the vast majority of his readers will bless him for many years to come on account of his apologetic and expository writings on the New Testament. As an interpreter of Holy Scripture he is almost always conspicuous for a strong, luminous, and reverent judgment—a judgment which is not crushed by massive learning, nor wearied by the incessant conflict of opinion, past and present, which he could not but hear around him, nor tempted from its path by some attractive paradox; a judgment which states its conclusions in language so simple, so clear, so absolutely devoid of pedantry, that probably only a few readers suspect what these conclusions really represent in the way of knowledge and thought. Nor was the late Bishop merely a scholar who lost sight of practical and spiritual interests in his absorbing intimacy with books; he was a great, because a hard-working and disinterested administrator. He brought to the government of his diocese the qualities which make his books what they are; and, as he leaves them, his clergy have come largely to reflect their Bishop's unwearied industry, his love of learning, his high integrity, his hopeful and patient zeal; above all, his devotion to the cause of our Lord and Saviour. It could hardly be otherwise, as they must know who have day afternoon, just as we were gathering for the had the happiness to come in contact with that in him which was greater than either his learning or his ability—I mean his character. Amidst tokens of a popularity in his University which was said to be unrivalled, and public distinctions which, as the years passed, crowded in upon him with ever-increasing importunity, he never seemed to lose a ray of the sweetness of temper, the simplicity, the unmistakable disinterestedness, the patient tolerance, as I have good reason to know, of differences of opinion, the deep and unaffected humility which were his distinguishing graces. Doubtless his episcopal brethren, his mourning diocese, his old University, and especially his surviving colleagues in its faculty of Theology, have a share in him larger than any to which we can here lay claim; but, assuredly, all who had the great happiness of being associated with him during his eight years' tenure of a canonry in this Cathedral Church, must feel his death to be nothing short of a great personal sorrow. It may safely be predicted that we and those who may succeed us will cherish his memory as we cherish that of another member of our body, who bore his Christian name and was, perhaps, the greatest of his predecessors in the See of Durham—Joseph Butler. We shall think of Joseph Lightfoot also as one of God's best gifts to us in the many centuries of our long history—as one of the brightest glories of St. Paul's. The paper to which I have referred was read by the late Bishop at a meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the society which I ask you to-day to strengthen by your interest, by your prayers, and by your contributions. For well nigh a century this Society alone did what it could to enable the Church of England to obey the Lord's parting command, and at this time it follows the flag and the enterprize of England, among all the nations of the world, and according to its ability it sows beside all waters the seeds of eternal life. Many of us may feel, I myself have felt, particular interest in local missions, in which a high standard of self-sacrifice and concentrated sympathies, and many and incessant prayers on the spot and at home, result in greater achievements than are possible everywhere over the wide field occupied by a great society; but it would be ungenerous as well as mistaken to allow these particular interests to deprive the oldest missionary agency amongst us of the means which are needed to enable it to cope with its immense opportunities, its immense responsibilities. Upper Burmah, a land so lately added to the British Empire, requires great and immediate efforts to enable us to do our duty to its teeming population. New Guinea and Corea had every claim upon us that either spiritual want on the one hand, or devoted service on the other, could possibly establish, while both in South and Central Africa, the last year or two have imposed on the Society tasks of the utmost magnitude

which it cannot hope to discharge without generous support from the Church at home.

Of this load let us bear in mind that we all of us owe allegiance to the Lord's parting command, that if we cannot discharge the duties He lays on us in person, we must do so by deputy; that we can all do something to prepare before Him the way of His last coming; that we all should qualify ourselves to be able to assure Him on His birthday—Christmas morning—that we have not utterly forgotten what we owe to the end and gracious purpose which drew Him down from His throne in heaven for the salvation of the world.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the see of Durham has been offered to the Bishop of Ripon and declined. The latest rumour is that the bishopric has been offered to the Very Rev. Randall T. Davidson, Dean of Windsor.

THE Rev. A. S. Jervis, of St. Andrew's, Worthing, has accepted an invitation to join the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians, with special duties as chaplain to the Sisters of Bethany, who have undertaken to found a branch house at Urmi, in Persia. The Sisters and Mr. Jervis will leave England in Easter week.

ON the 30th ult., at the monthly meeting of the council of the Corporation of the Church House, the Archbishop of Canterbury presiding, Sir A. Blomfield submitted his plans for the permanent building. We understand the building will have a quadrangle in the centre. The Houses of Convocation will be on the north side, facing Dean's-yard, the great hall on the south, the House of Laymen on the west, and the library on the east. All these will be built on the first floor with rooms beneath them. The chapel, which will be a small one, will be built on pillars, and will be situated in the quadrangle. The great hall will be erected first, as the leases from the tenants of the houses on the site where it is to be built are the first to fall in; and taking this and other considerations into account it would seem to be undoubtedly best to begin with this part of the building. The ultimate purpose of the great hall is to serve for public meetings of Church societies, but by a system of movable partitions it can also be made to meet the requirements of the Houses of Convocation for a time. The rooms below the hall will be arranged to serve as a library until the permanent library is built. The use of the hall for public meetings will tend to familiarise Church people with the meaning and purpose of the Church House. Ample accommodation is to be made for committee-rooms and for offices for Church societies. Sir Arthur Blomfield has been requested to prepare the elevation plans at once, and when these have been submitted to the council—which will probably be at the end of February—they will be on view, together with the ground plans, to the public. The council has already made provision at the temporary Church House (Nos. 10 and 11, Dean's yard) for a writing-room, library, committee-rooms, offices for Church societies, lavatories, as well as a room for public meetings, which is capable of holding 200 people. This latter has been granted by the council to the House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury to hold their sessions in.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1890.

COLONIZATION OF PALESTINE.

THERE is something strangely pathetic about a movement lately set on foot by some poetical devotees of the Jewish creed, and it reminds us wonderfully of the spirit that must have instigated the national dirge which comes to us in those well-known lines beginning "By the waters of Babylon." This movement has a religious element at its base, and seems to be grounded upon a desire to raise the *locus standi* of "the chosen people." It seems that there is a renewed vitality amid the leaders of Judaism, and this renewed vitality among their poets, teachers and writers is attributed to the rejuvenescence of the "faith of ages." Those whose minds can soar above the trumpery details of the usual very narrow field of Jewish every-day life, seem to have come to the conclusion that all the indignities to which the Jews as a nation feel themselves subjected are due to the fact that the Jewish law is not maintained in its entirety, and this they assert is quite impossible under existing conditions, not only here in this country, where the standard of religious life amongst them is at its lowest, but even in other parts of the world, inasmuch as external influences are everywhere too powerful to admit of the due performance of many religious rites, &c., which they claim as indispensable. They maintain that the strongest and perhaps the only hope which can be held out for the restoration of their nation's honour is the restoration of their nation to their country. Then, they maintain, an ideal state of affairs will soon be inaugurated, and with the pride which is characteristic of the nation, they assert that Jerusalem shall be a social, political, and religious

centre, controlling and regulating the affairs of the world by some international system of arbitration, whose centre of action shall be the capital of Palestine. This, we have heard it asserted, is the necessary result of re-union among Jews, and will of course tend to settle all social difficulties in all parts of the world. With some such views as these as the ultimate ideal to be aimed at, a society has been formed entitled The Palestine Colonization Society, bearing the truly touching Hebrew title, which, translated, means "Lovers of Zion," having as primary object the return of Jews to the land of their fathers, there to re-establish the condition of things inculcated by the Mosaic Law. This movement is one neither to be ignored or ridiculed, for its influence is making itself most widely felt, and is in true harmony with the unfolding of events as demonstrated in our acceptance of the interpretation of prophecy. One of the most salient features of this movement is the unexpected success with which it has been accompanied, for up to the present time this society claims to have been instrumental in establishing no fewer than fifteen colonies in the Holy Land. There is, however, nothing Christian about this colonization scheme, and if its prophets understand their own motives we should be disposed to call it anti-Christian, for it is, to a very great extent, the disintegration of the nation which Christian influences are slowly, but surely, bringing about in the populous Jewish colony in East London that has directed the minds of these enthusiasts to devise a means for the consolidation of their brethren into their pristine national unity.

We cannot help contrasting these views with those promulgated by Baron Hirsch whose object is also to benefit the nation. How divergent, how contradictory their methods! He would urge forward the assimilation of the Jews by the Gentile nations, among whom they live. He would have them seek for positions of honour and reverence amidst the general Judæo-Gentile mass. Whereas the colonization party can only see a future prosperity in the re-establishment of a Jewish rule as supreme in the land of Palestine, we confess to seeing more of the spirit of the prophets in the latter view, and whilst the motive is not in accordance with our views, the issue is one which, we believe, will be made use of by God to bring about His own ends more speedily.

DR. MOMERIE, on his return to the Foundling Hospital on Sunday week, after his Christmas holiday, referred in the course of his sermon to the rumours that had been circulated concerning his inhibition or suspension. He stated that his last published volume of sermons had been sent to the Bishop of London, and that his lordship had uttered no word of condemnation or even of disapproval. It is stated, however, says the *St. James's Gazette*, that Dr. Momerie intends shortly to resign the preachership at the Foundling on the ground of overwork.

Reviews and Notices.

"CHRIST AND HIS SURROUNDINGS." Three Lectures at Manchester Cathedral. By James Moorhouse, Bishop of Manchester. Manchester: J. Heywood.

BISHOP MOORHOUSE is one of that small, but we trust increasing, minority on the Episcopal bench who believe that the chief duties of a bishop and shepherd of souls are, not to conduct a ceremonial nor to superintend the working of an organisation, but to guide human minds and spirits into the way of truth and peace. He has an intense contempt for three popular *isms*—dogmatism, ritualism, and sabbatism. We wonder whether he is conscious, as he well might be, that these three *isms*—of which the third is nearly dead, but the two former all alive and flourishing—sum up the whole contemporary religion of the period in which his own lot is cast. He sees that something deeper than any of these three is required from every person who ventures to teach, and especially from every bishop; and that the honest doubt of the present period cannot be resolved by a declaration of Church authority, nor intimidated by a threat of eternal damnation, but must be met by calm and solid argument, sufficient to convince thoughtful and conscientious men.

These three lectures are an honest attempt at such guidance. Their object is to point to Christ as a phenomenon which cannot be accounted for except on the supposition that He is Divine. The author pronounces Him to be the great miracle of history. He shows how among the thoughts about God, which already existed in a scattered condition, Jesus selected one to be the master-thought of religion, "The Fatherhood of God." He then asks whence He could have derived this thought? and answers: Not from the Gentiles, either through the Greek and Roman settlements in Palestine, or through the Jewish pilgrims of the Diaspora (Dispersion); not from the Essenes; still less from the Jewish influences then existing, especially from that of the Scribes, the chief teachers of the nation, whose principles and method were directly opposed to His; from no contemporary or pre-existing source whatever; therefore from God.

> Suppose that we came to believe, or at least to suspect, that Jesus was no more than man, then, indeed, the thought of this wonderful personality must present itself to us as a portentous difficulty. Can we conceive a human being born into the world with so dazzling a genius and so mighty a force of will, that he alone of all mankind can hold off from his God-like nature all obscurations of his intuition, all seductions of his will, all modifications of his idiosyncrasy? Then, surely, we make the man a god in order to deny that God became man.

Having thus vindicated the title of our Lord to the original authorship of His central doctrine, he takes up in his second lecture another of His most prominent ideas, that of the kingdom of God, and traces it also to its origin. He shows from the Jewish Apocalyptic literature, which originated in the Book of Daniel, was continued in many succeeding writings, and was exceedingly popular in our Lord's time, that an expectation of such a kingdom was at that time universal among the Jews; that, as popularly held, it was full of coarse, literal, carnal hopes of a mere earthly triumph of the Jewish nation, though mixed, in different proportions according to the greater or less spirituality of each Apocalyptic writer, with higher anticipations of a coming reign of truth and righteous-

ness. The Bishop shows that in this case our Lord's originality consisted in His having the spiritual insight to cast away all the earthly carnal dreams, and to offer instead the idea of a kingdom purely spiritual, in which not the Jews only, but all mankind, shall recognise God as the Universal Father, and themselves as brethren, all sharing in the universal love. And he asks again: "Whence did Jesus get this idea, which could only have originated in a mind perfectly pure?" He then tries to show that the internal struggle and conflict which is observable in our Lord at several points of His career—at the Temptation, at the moment when Peter acted as a Satan to Him, most of all at the Garden of Gethsemane—was caused by a temptation to mix the low Jewish idea (with which, as a Jew Himself, he could not but feel some sympathy) with His own idea of a kingdom of universal love. He holds that our Lord overcame this temptation, and continued to the end the perfect example, in human form and amidst human limitations, of all-embracing love, unimpaired by the slightest tinge of selfishness, and, as such, the true Incarnation of the God who is Love. At this point it occurs to us to ask whether the Bishop thinks that this Incarnation or embodiment of the principle of perfect love in the *affections*, *disposition*, *character*, *spirit* of a living man is the whole solid content of the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation? Does he also think that a material, physical Incarnation or embodiment of the Deity by supernatural generation in the *body* of a living man was needed and actually took place? Or does he think the latter doctrine to be only the drapery in which the former is clothed?

The Bishop, having thus shown that, both with respect to the morality which He taught, and to the kingdom which He announced, our Lord had derived little or nothing either from His precursors or His surroundings, proceeds lastly to deal with His teaching about the Unseen World. And in dealing with this last, the most difficult of his three subjects, he is very careful to request that what he says on this point may be taken, "not as authoritative teaching on the faith, but rather as brotherly helps and suggestions for the guidance of his readers' own thoughts."

He points out that our Lord adopted in many respects the outward form of the popular teaching of His time, the drapery in which the Jewish teachers had been wont to clothe their more spiritual ideas, especially the imagery in which Isaiah and other prophets had symbolised mere national distress and ruin, under the figure of a shaking of the solid earth, and a quenching of the lights of heaven. He thinks that, in passages like Matthew xxiv. 29 and xxvi. 64, the Lord is not really predicting a great cosmical catastrophe, but merely a spiritual victory on earth of the doctrines of the Son of Man. He dwells especially upon the ἀπ' ἄρτι in the latter passage, which appears to him to announce an immediate, not a distant future, change; and he thus paraphrases our Lord's solemn words to the high priest: "From henceforth ye, His enemies, shall see the Son of Man reigning in the supreme seat of Divine dominion, and coming in the sight of all men, through all the ages, on the glory clouds of His spiritual victories."

We have not space to follow the Bishop through his views of our Lord's belief in an Unseen World, containing evil beings as well as good ones, of His allusions to the Gehenna, to eternal (or æonian) punishment, and eternal (or æonian) life. We merely commend them to our readers as the sincere attempt of a man, invested with the weightiest of responsibilities, to guide those of whose souls he feels himself to have been placed in charge, in those deeper questions which are sometimes obscured and placed out of sight by the frivolous trivialities which make up the religion of the hour, but which must work their way to the front again, unless religion is to sink entirely into a ceremonial and a partisanship, content with employing and amusing trifling minds, and originating and promoting shallow temporary agitations, but unable to give any answers to the serious inquiries which men who long for truth and reality are everywhere making about their own souls, and God, and eternity.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—In the PULPIT of 18th and 25th I find more than four columns occupied with observations on statements made by myself concerning the greatest question that can engage the human faculties. I hope I may be allowed rather more space than usual in your valuable periodical.

In the letter of Mr. Walker, which appeared on 18th, he charges Universalists with throwing doubts on the words of Christ. This is extremely unfair, as their contention is, that the words of the Saviour do not teach the doctrine of eternal punishment.

He also charges them with upholding the Kingdom of Purgatory, which he says was a discovery of the 13th century. In reply to that I will bring forward some quotations from the earliest Christian writers. S. Jerome, 378: "The Lord descended to the place of punishment and torment, in which was the rich man, in order to liberate the prisoners." S. Chrysostom, 398: "The fire of Gehenna is extinguished; the sleepless worm dies: those who were in Hades are set free from bonds." S. Clement, 190: "So Christ saves all men; some He converts by penalties." Titus, 364: "The very pit itself is a place of torments and of punishments, but is not eternal ...It was made that it might be a medicine, and yield help to those who sin." S. Gregory of Nazianzus, 370: "Christ burst open the dark portals of Hades and gave liberty to the souls." S. Gregory of Nyssa, 380, speaks of Christ as "both freeing mankind from their wickedness, and healing the very inventor of wickedness (the Devil)." He also says "it is needful that at some time evil shall be removed utterly and entirely from the realm of existence." Didemus, 380: "For as men, by giving up their sins, are made subject to Him, so, too, the higher intelligences...are made subject to Him, on the completion of the dispensation ordered for the salvation of all...Everything inflicted by God is inflicted for the sake of utility." It is deserving of notice that some of those good men read the New Testament in their native tongue; and it is clear they did not believe that the endlessness of sin and misery was taught by Christ.—I take the above passages from "Primitive Universalism."

I now come to one of your correspondents whose style of controversy appears to me to deviate frequently from the rules of fairness and courtesy. He makes the extraordinary assertion that Col. i. 20

does not "give the slightest hint of the final restoration theory of all mankind." He adds: "No mind accustomed to anything like proof or rigour of reasoning would have brought forward such texts in support of such a theory." I suppose he will hardly pretend that the authors of that grand book, "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul," Rev. Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, were deficient in intellectual ability. They say in a note on 1 Col. 20, in chap. xxv.: "This statement of the infinite extent of the results of Christ's redemption (which may well fill us with reverential awe) has been a sore stumbling-block to many commentators, who have devised various (and some very ingenious) modes of explaining it away." They moreover understand this passage and Hebr. ix. 23 to intimate that "the heavenly hosts themselves stood in need of His atonement." Olshausen, in his commentaries on Ephes i. 10 and Col. i. 20, admits that the phraseology employed by the Apostle Paul requires us to include evil spirits and all other intelligent beings in this comprehensive design of reconciliation and gathering together in one.

I observe the irrelevant remark that we never read of the ministry of reconciliation being committed to devils. That is true; but we see in the case of Job that the Divine Being makes use of the instrumentality of Satan in the fulfilment of His own wise and benevolent purposes. So likewise He maketh the wrath of man to praise Him, and the remainder thereof He restrains.

I think I need not say much on the remarks of the gentleman whose sentences appeared to me "hopelessly incoherent." I see Mr. Murphy says that much was unintelligible to him. This gentleman seems to claim credit for moderation and self-control. Do such phrases as *perfectly absurd* and *without sense and reason* afford proofs of those qualities?

I find it clearly stated in the Bible that it is the design of God to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, happy, and holy immortality. I did not say that some of them are not prepared in this life, but that those who are not will be prepared in a future life. If *all* are reconciled, the conclusion is inevitable that those who do not wish to be reconciled will gradually have their feelings altered through penalties and the softening influence of Christ's love, who will ultimately draw *all* unto Himself. That is what I mean by *momentous processes.*

God will not reconcile sin, death, hell, to Himself, but will abolish them. He will reconcile *all living intelligent* beings who have sinned, even the greatest sinners, by delivering them from sin.

As far as I have read the works of Universalists they all regard the Scheme of Redemption through Christ as the basis of all hope. If this is denied let the evidences be brought forward.

There is an important consideration to which I can only refer briefly. The Septuagint was familiarly known in the age of Christ and the Apostles. In it the words *aion* and *aionios* are employed to signify limited durations, as in Ps. civ. 5, cxlviii. 6, lxxxix. 28-37; Eccles. i. 4: "The earth abideth for ever."

I have no doubt the foregoing correspondents sincerely believe the Universalist doctrines have a very injurious tendency. I suppose most of those who first heard or read Luther's statements thought the same of them; and Saul of Tarsus was quite convinced of the evil nature of Christian teaching. I have long entertained a sad and solemn belief that the doctrines called orthodox, have had a very disastrous effect on the human intellect, feelings, and conduct. J. B.

Canonbury, 27th January, 1890.

THE LATE DR. LITTLEDALE.

SIR,—It is a good rule, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, but there are exceptions. When a man is held forth to Romanists, Dissenters, etc., as a representative man of Church principles, the case must be fairly examined and stated. Dr. Littledale is so held up in the Church organs in England and Ireland. Now, Dr. Littledale did the greatest service to Church truth by his "Petrine Claims," and his exposure of Mariolatry. But two publications of his I have to protest against. The first is "The Christian Passover." It argues, contrary to the 4th Article, that our Lord's Body has not now all that appertains to the perfection to man's nature, that it is not now bound to one place at a time. At page 15 we read, "It has been argued that, as a man cannot be in two places at once, and that as Christ is man in Heaven, therefore He cannot be there and on an altar on earth at the same time." This, so despised, is exactly the argument of the Black Rubric, as well as of the 4th Article. But Dr. Littledale puts both aside. He goes on, "This is to forget that He is God and Man in one person." Nay, but Dr. Littledale forgets what Hooker says, that to give His manhood the attributes of His Godhead, is to make Him no man at all. At page 16 we are told that His Body passed through the sealed rock, though the Gospel says that the stone was rolled away, so that He had place of egress. As to the doors being closed for fear of the Jews, that does not prove that our Lord did not open the door to pass through. Nor, if He did miraculously pass through door or rock, would this prove that His Body is not bound by the limits of other bodies, any more than His walking on the water before His death proves the same thing. What Dr. Littledale and his party want to make out is, that the words "This is my Body," prove that not only His Body is present by spirit and grace, as Ridley said, but that there is present His Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity. But it is to be remembered that He did not say this is Myself, but only "this is My Body." It is useless referring to John vi. till we are told what is meant by the bread which came down from Heaven. Was it His flesh which never came down from Heaven? Was it the same as His flesh which, on Calvary, He gave for the life of the world. This has never been explained by either Rome or the Ritualists. The other objectionable publication of Dr. Littledale is his "Words for Truth." In this pamphlet, page 9, he tries to unite Romish teaching as to the Presence with that of the Black Rubric. Rome, he says, has given up the Transubstantiation. This, the editor of the *Catholic Press* for March, 1888, scorns, and all their catechisms disprove. Dr. Littledale, having tried to lower the Roman side of the river of division, next would raise up our side, to make the level complete. He asserts "the practical abandonment of transubstantiation (though the name is still retained) by Roman theologians. For whereas they formerly taught that only mere phantasms of bread and wine survive after consecration, now the received teaching is that no physicial change whatever, of which the senses can take cognisance, is effected by consecration, but that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before." Was there ever such nonsense as this? What did

they teach before? That only phantasms remain. What do they teach now? The very same, that only phantasms remain! Now, he says, the received teaching is that no physical change whatever, of which the senses can take cognisance, is effected. But that is exactly what they held before. For a learned man like Dr. Littledale, for such his Petrine Claims, etc., prove him to have been—for such a man to write such childish twaddle is past comprehension. But now let us see how he manipulated our Black Rubric, for he must raise us to meet the lowered Romanism on the other side of the valley or river dividing us. After giving his absurd version of Rome's present belief, which is exactly as it was before, he says, "this is the Anglican doctrine that '*they* remain in their very natural substances,' expressed in other but equivalent language" to that of Trent. Was there ever a more daring falsehood than this? What the Black Rubric says remains is the substance of Bread. Dr. Littledale says it is the accidents remain unchanged in their very natural substance, as if look, taste, and smell have any natural substance to remain in separate from their substratum, called substance. I am sorry to have to say aught but *bonum* of the dead. But I cannot allow Rome and the Dissenters to say of such teaching, that it is recognised as the orthodox doctrine of the churches of England and Ireland. It has been suggested to me that, by "only mere phantasms," Dr. Littledale meant appearances alone, as if Rome once held that the *look* alone of bread remained. But this is not so. She always maintained that with the look remain taste, smell and feel. Phantasm is equivalent to the word he uses afterwards, "accidents." If his attempt to prove that Rome has changed rests on any difference between phantasms and accidents it is a perfect absurdity, as the editor of the *Catholic Press* declares. It has been also suggested to me that there may be a doubt as to Dr. Littledale's meaning as to the Black Rubric. I will quote his own words again. Rome teaches "that all the accidents of the bread and wine remain as they were before. This is the Anglican doctrine that '*they* remain in their very natural substances' expressed in other but equivalent language." The Roman doctrine, Dr. Littledale says, is ours, that they remain in their natural substances. What Rome says remain are the accidents. What the Black Rubric says remain are the very bread and wine. What does Dr. Littledale say remains? I leave it to any jury of plain men to say. Dr. Littledale tells us, as do others of his school, that Transubstantiation is not a theological, but merely a philosophical question. Does he mean that *so* Rome regards it? Not so, for she excommunicates all who deny it. No doubt she tries to explain it philosophically; but so she might the Unity of the Trinity, and the two natures of our Lord. I see that the *Church Times* for this week defends Elevation. This explains its disavowal of Edward's first Book, because it forbids elevation and showing to the people. (See page 203 of new edition, Griffith and Co., London.) Edward's first Book is now held as Protestant as his second.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

"PERFECTLY ABSURD."

SIR,—I am glad that "Presbyter" feels that the effect of my writing is as the launching of thunderbolts. I am sorry that the castle of error in which he has lodged himself is so impregnable. This is ever so. It is not the province of human wit to supplant, by Divine truth, unaided by Divine power, where the strongholds are so many. I shall, notwithstanding, wherever I can and whenever I can, do my part.

"Presbyter" says that my interpretation of "J. B.'s" *dictum* is incorrect. The *dictum* is: "It is the purpose of God to prepare all His intelligent creatures for a safe, holy, and happy immortality through processes which take place during *aions or ages*." My first inference from this was that all were not prepared at death. I gave our friend credit for allowing that a principle was universal in its application. I concluded that therefore none were prepared. Does "Presbyter" deny that the inference is legitimate? Will he affirm boldly that some men are prepared before and others after death? This is the point that I should like to see clearly stated.

If "Presbyter" means this—and I suppose he does—why then he distinctly admits that God governs the world on two contrary principles. Surely this inference is more absurd than the other.

I do not see what the *aions* have to do with this question. I suppose every one knows, and needs not to be told, that there are different ages. I did not carelessly overlook anything. I simply gave "J. B." credit for a little common sense. The way he put the matter, as I have clearly shown, involves an absurdity, unless he is prepared to admit that all men stand on the same footing when they die. I believe that this is the view which the majority of Universalists hold. I think I do them no injustice when I express their views of humanity generally in these words: "Men are pretty much alike."

Mr. Lawrence says that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Erskine are both Universalist writers who regard our Lord's Atonement as the foundation of the Christian hope. There are some amongst our Anglican Catholic friends who have taken the Wesleyan term "conversion," and used it in a sense entirely different. They have the word, but they have not the thing. It is so with the few writers—I was not aware that there were any—amongst the Universalists with respect to the Atonement. They have the word; but the substance is wanting.

Mr. Murphy finds Universalism in the familiar passage, "All enemies shall be abolished, and God shall be all in all." The passage, as it stands, is not familiar to me; but we will not quibble about that. I am writing to ask Mr. Murphy, if, when the Master of the house has abolished an offender because of his offences in it, that he is in the habit of regarding such an one as still in receipt of His grace and goodness? This is certainly a new way of looking at things—one which will oblige us to think that the opposite is always meant to that which words would imply.

The Atonement, as it is generally understood, affects men only in this life. Does not Mr. Murphy see that the invention of other processes, to be worked out after death, either runs alongside the Atonement in its efficacy, or otherwise supplants it? In either case the virtue of the Atonement is destroyed. It is not by it, and by it alone, as the orthodox hold, that sinners are saved.

I am quite prepared to admit that there is much that is beautiful in these writers; but that renders caution all the more necessary. There is often a cancer under the tongue possessed by a beautiful face.

J. P. SANDLANDS,
Brigstock Vicarage, Feb. 1st, 1890.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—With your permission, I should like to lay before your readers the results of some recent researches into the medical language, which, as it is asserted, is to be found in the Gospel according to St. Luke.

I pointed out long ago that (as it appeared to me) "the radical defect in Dr. Hobart's laborious work* was that he took so little account of the Septuagint." I may now say that I can find no proof that the writer of the Third Gospel was a medical man, although two or three not uncommon medical expressions may occur in the narrative, just as some phrases connected with agriculture, architecture, seamanship, and military and legal affairs are also to be found therein.

I will first of all mention a few obvious errors into which Dr. Hobart seems to have fallen. Let us begin with the instructive word προστιθέναι, page 104. This is Dr. Hobart's account of the matter:—"Προστίθεναι is used by St Luke more than twice as often as it is in the entire of the rest of the New Testament, he using it thirteen times, viz.: Luke iii. 20; xii. 25; xii. 31; xvii. 5; xix. 11; xx. 11; xx. 12; Acts ii. 41; ii. 47; v. 14; xi. 24; xii. 3; xiii. 36; the other writers five times. . . . His use of it probably arose from his medical pursuits, as it was a very frequent and necessary word in medical language, chiefly with reference to the application of remedies to the body. The frequency and nature of its use may be seen from the subjoined passages from Hippocrates . . . Galen uses it similarly." Dr. Hobart adds many quotations, which fill a page and a-half, from the principal Greek medical writers. Now, at first sight, all this seems very convincing; but let us scrutinise it carefully in the dry light of criticism. Let me, then, ask, Did the writer of the Third Gospel derive his use of the word προστίθεναι from Hippocrates, or from the Greek Version of the Jewish Scriptures, everywhere current in the Apostolic age, which is known as the Septuagint? (Scrivener, "Introduction to Criticism of New Testament," p. 558.) Let us examine the facts, and then let any unprejudiced reader decide. I venture to say that Dr. Hobart is entirely mistaken.

Now, turning to two of the passages named, we find προσέθετο πέμψαι ("And again he sent"), Luke xx. 12; προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν ("And . . . he proceeded further to take"), Acts xii. 3. Precisely similar expressions are to be found in the Septuagint: Προσέθετο ἀποστειλαι (Numbers xxii. 15; 4 Kings i. 13); προσέθετο λαλῆσαι (Isaiah vii. 10; viii. 5). Now this form of speech is not only to be found in the Septuagint; it is not only, as Alford says, a "Hebraism," but it is as Winer (Gram. of New Testament Greek, p. 40) observes, "a *pure* Hebraism," and "opposed to the spirit of the Greek language." I may further add that it is a very common Hebraism, and is a good example of the *circumstantiality* (Winer, p. 33) that is such a conspicuous feature of Hellenistic Greek (the expression of *Hebrew* thought), which is not satisfied unless it describes, in addition to the action, the successive steps and the mode of progress of the action. Just as the Greek-speaking Jew prefixed ἤρξατο (he began) to an infinitive or participle to mark the *beginning* (Gen. xi. 6; Deut. i. 5; Mark vi. 2; Acts i. 1), and συνετέλεσε (he finished) to mark the *end* (Deut. xxxi. 1; Josh. iv. 1; Judges xv. 17; 3 Kings ix. 1), so he prefixed προσέθετο (he added) in order to denote the *continuance* or *repetition* or *progress* of the action (Gen. iv. 2, Ald., Complut.). What light can Hippocrates or Galen or the other medical writers who were not Jews throw on this—a peculiar Hebraic mode of thought? None at all. They have, and can have, nothing whatever to do with it. The phrase occurs in the Third Gospel because of the writer's familiarity (by reason of his regular Sabbath attendance at the synagogue) with the Septuagint. After this it is scarcely necessary to investigate Dr. Hobart's other references to this word; but I may just as well mention that προσέθηκε ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, in Luke iii. 20 occurs in Ecclesiastes i. 16; προσθεὶς εἶπε, in Luke xix. 11, is to be found in Job xxvii. 1; xxix. 1; προστεθήσεται, in Luke xii. 31, occurs in Prov. ix. 11; προστετέθη πρός, in Acts xiii. 36, occurs in Genesis xxv. 8; προσετέθησαν, in Acts ii. 41, is to be found in 1 Macc. ii. 43.

Let us now consider the word σκληροτράχηλος, as to which Dr. Hobart, p. 209, remarks: "This word, used by the LXX., is found in St. Luke alone of the New Testament writers. He, however, was accustomed to the use of it in his medical practice. Hippocrates, Coac. Progn. 161: τράχηλος σκληρός," etc. Did it not occur to Dr. Hobart, when he thus mentioned the use of σκληροτράχηλος in the LXX. (Exodus xxxiii. 5), that the writer of the Jewish narrative of the Third Gospel and the Acts (full of references to the LXX.) would most naturally have derived it from that Septuagint Version with which every devout Jew was necessarily familiar. The word is one of many mentioned by Winer (page 27) as having been probably "coined by the Greek-speaking Jews, or the New Testament writers themselves." It is to be found in the speech of Stephen, the first martyr, and Bishop Wordsworth points out that "St. Stephen was a Hellenist, and almost all his references to the Old Testament are to the Septuagint Version." Moreover, the following is the context of the passage (Acts vii. 51) in which σκληροτράχηλος occurs: σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι τῇ καρδιᾷ καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ("Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears.") Surely the word ἀπερίτμητος (περιτομή=circumcision) is peculiarly suggestive of Judaism, and when we find in the Jewish prophet Ezekiel this very phrase, ἀπερίτμητοι καρδιᾷ (Ezek. xliv. 7-9), and in the Jewish prophet Jeremiah the similar expression, ἀπερίτμητα τὰ ὦτα (Jer. vi. 10), can the slightest dependence be placed on Dr. Hobart's assertion that the moral and metaphorical use of the word σκληροτράχηλος in the Acts, is due to the writer's medical practice with regard to *stiff necks* (!)? No, I venture to say positively but politely, not so; its use in the Acts is a necessary result of the writer's intimate acquaintance with the Septuagint.

Let us now take a third example: "Πνοή, peculiar to St. Luke," says Dr. Hobart, p. 236, "was employed in medical language," etc.; and several appropriate quotations from Hippocrates are, as usual, appended. But what do we find? Πνοή occurs twice in the Acts. In Acts ii. 2 it is associated with the words ἄφνω, φερόμενος, βίαιος. All these four words (including πνοή) are to be found in the LXX.

* "The Medical Language of St. Luke: a Proof from Internal Evidence that the Gospel according to St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles were written by the same Person, and that the Writer was a Medical Man." By the Rev. William Kirk Hobart, LL.D., Ex-Scholar Trinity College, Dublin. 1882. Dublin University Press Series.

Πνοή occurs again in Acts xvii. 25 in St. Paul's address to the Athenians. Now, St. Paul's speeches in the Acts, as I have elsewhere shown, do undoubtedly contain many of the Apostle's own phrases, as preserved in his Epistles. Hence if the use of *πνοή* is a sign of medical knowledge, this would only tend to prove that St. Paul was a medical man! But a closer examination reveals the fact that St. Paul is speaking of the Creator as "giving to all *life* and *breath* and all things" (*διδοὺς ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν*, Acts xvii. 25). What is this but an obvious reference by the Greek-speaking Jew, St. Paul, to the opening chapters of his own sacred books, Genesis ii. 7, where it is recorded that, at the creation of man, God "breathed into his nostrils the *breath* of *life*" (*πνοὴν ζωῆς*)?

Many other instances might be added—their name is legion; but is there any need to trespass further on your space? I will merely observe that had Dr. Hobart only carefully examined the very first Book of the LXX.—the Book of Genesis—he would have avoided many pitfalls and errors. Take, for instance, the word *συγχύσις* (Acts xix. 29), translated *confusion*. Dr. Hobart, p. 187, remarks: "*συγχύσις* is peculiar to St. Luke. In medical language it was used for 'a disturbance of the system,' 'an affection of the eyes,'" etc.; Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides all being impressed into Dr. Hobart's service to establish the point. But let me ask, is not *συγχύσις* just the simple Greek equivalent for the Hebrew בָּבֶל, *Babel*, =*Confusion*, to be found in the early chapters of Genesis, ch. x. 10; xi. 9? And was not this word—occurring, as it does, in the Second of the Parashahs, or Proper Lessons of the Law (cf. Acts xiii. 14, 15; xv. 21) ("Moses being read in the Synagogue every Sabbath Day"),—perfectly familiar, in consequence, to every worshipper in the synagogue? Far from showing that the writer of the Third Gospel and the Acts was a medical man, these instances adduced by Dr. Hobart really prove my assertion made in a former number of the PULPIT,* namely, that the author of the Acts was a *Jew*.

H. HEBER EVANS.

January 10th, 1890.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

* April 17th, 1886.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bateman, Rev. W. H. F., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Micklegate, York,
Bent, Rev. Robert Paul, M A., Rector of Hedgerley; Rector of Coln St. Dennis, Gloucestershire.
Brown, Rev. Peter, Perpetual Curate of Shocklach, Cheshire.
Browne, Rev. Charles Gordon, M.A., Assistant Secretary to the English Church Union.
Carlyle, Rev. Alex James, late Curate of St. Stephen's, Westminster; Secretary for General Purposes to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
Carr, Rev. Edgar, Vicar of Ainderby Steeple; Rector of Kirkby Wicke, Yorkshire.
Cook, Rev. H. L., Vicar of Skipton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Daniel, Rev. W. E., M.A., Rural Dean of Shepton Mallet.
Davies, Rev. David, Vicar of Alltmawr, Breconshire; Vicar of Llangynog, Breconshire, by dispensation.
Forbes, Rev. J. de B., Chaplain at St. Petersburg.
Gedge, Rev. J. W., M.A., Rector of Buriton; Rector of St. Anthony's, Stepney.
Gibbons, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of St. Gregory-the-Great, Canterbury; Rector of Upton Pyne, near Exeter.
Gilbert, Rev. C. R., M.A., Head Master of the Coventry Grammar School.
Goodrick, Rev. A. T. S., M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; Rector of Bardwell, Suffolk.
Herbert, Rev. Septimus, M.A., Vicar of Iver, Bucks.
Hesilige, Rev. C. M., Curate; Vicar of Weston, near Otley.
Hyslop, Rev. Andrew A. E., Incumbent of the Welsh Church, Cardiff; Vicar of All Saints', Cardiff.
Jacoby, Rev. G. W. J., Vicar of Aylesby; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Grimsby Deaneries.
Laseron, Rev. D., East London Clergyman.
Lester, Rev. J. H., M.A., Rector of South Hackney, and Honorary Canon of Lichfield; Rector of Lexden, Colchester.
Martell, Rev. A. W. F., Rector of St. Anthony's, Stepney; Rector of Buriton, Petersfield, Hants.
Matthews, Rev. Andrew Hughes John, B.A., Rector of Laughton.
Morgan, Rev. J. W., B.A., Chaplain of Christ Church, Pau.
Northcote, Rev. Hon. Arthur F., M.A., Rector of Washfield, Tiverton; Vicar of St. Gregory-the-Great, Canterbury.
Nunns, Rev. T. J., M.A., Vicar of Launceston, Cornwall.
Quarry, Rev. Richard, M.A., Vicar of Gaddesby, Leicester.
Reed, Rev. Martin, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Leicester; Vicar of Lenton, Lincolnshire.
Street, Rev. James, M.A., Chaplain of the Boys' Home, Regent's Park-road, London; Vicar of All Saints', Rockwell-green, Wellington, Somerset.
Ward, Rev. Chares Cotterill, M.A., Vicar of Little Tew, Oxon.
Waugh, Rev. A. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Brighton, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon; Vicar of Otley, Yorkshire.
Wright, Rev. Alban Henry, General Licence to Officiate in the Diocese of Peterborough.
Yates, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Cottingham; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Peterborough,

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alderson, Rev. James Thomas, Hon. Canon of Southwell, and for thirty-five years Rector of Ravenstone, at Ravenstone Rectory, on the 27th ult., aged 64.
Bernard, Rev. Charles Brodrick, Lord Bishop of Tuam, at the Palace, Tuam, on the 31st ult., aged 79.
Brooking, Rev. Arthur, at West-hill House, Frome Selwood, on the 28th ult., aged 80.
Fagan, Rev. Charles Christopher Thomas, Chaplain in India, and afterwards at Tangier, at Onelto House, Tangier, on the 20th ult., aged 42.
Harcourt-Vernon, Rev. Canon Evelyn Hardolph, of 104, Cromwell-road, London, at Toronto, Canada, on the 26th ult.
Linskill, Rev. John Anthony Pearson, for thirty-three years Rector of Beaudesert, at Beaudesert Rectory, on the 1st inst.,
Wrenford, Rev. Thomas Brookes, D.D., twenty-two years Vicar of the parish, at Watton Vicarage, Norfolk, on the 23rd ult., aged 67.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRIST'S EDUCATION.

By the Most Rev. the Bishop of MEATH.

Sermon Preached on the 1st Sunday after Epiphany.

"How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?"—Luke ii. 49.

THE incident in our Saviour's life which the Church would have us contemplate to-day, is remarkable on several grounds. It contains the only recorded saying of our Lord before He entered on His ministry. It fixes the relation in which He stood to Joseph and Mary in His youth. It flashes a momentary light on the gradual development of His self-consciousness; and it is stamped with the seal of veracity by the nature of the transaction recorded.

The two opening chapters of St. Luke are so different in style from the rest of his Gospel that I cannot imagine them to have been composed by the Evangelist himself. But this does not throw the least discredit on them; for when to this particular difference of style is added the peculiarity of their contents,—domestic matters which could not be known outside the limits of the families of Jesus and of John the Baptist,—I am irresistibly impressed with the conviction that they are a domestic memoir, written by some member of one of those sacred families, and incorporated into his Gospel by St. Luke unaltered. If we, then, further enquire by what member of either of these families this memoir can have been written, though no certainty is, of course, attainable, I must say that I think there is a high probability of its having been written by the Mother of Jesus. She had full information of the dealings of God with Elizabeth and her husband Zacharias; and she alone could have been personally cognisant of the message brought by the angel Gabriel to herself, as well as of what had passed in the recesses of her own heart on the occasion brought before us by the Gospel of this day.

There is a very similar reason for believing the first two chapters of St. Matthew to have been written by Mary's husband, Joseph. For those chapters contain things that could have been, in the first instance, known only to himself; and they differ in style from the rest of the Gospel, though not, perhaps, so strikingly as do the first two chapters of St. Luke. We have then, in the introductory chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, a true "Gospel of the Infancy," due in all probabi ity to the parents, real and reputed, of our blessed Lord: and we may be pleased, in this singularly symmetrical arrangement, to acknowledge a debt of gratitude to them for the information which they alone could give, though we dare not pay them the all-but adoration which the modern, not the ancient or even the mediæval, Church of Rome inculcates.

Let us now proceed to examine the narrative preserved, though not written, by St. Luke.

In the 41st verse of this second chapter we are told that the parents of Jesus were in the yearly habit of going up to Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover: the greatest of the three great Jewish festivals, and the only one which women were expected to attend. Children before the age of twelve were not bound to frequent these feasts; but at the age of twelve a boy became, in Jewish parlance, "a Son of the Law," personally responsible for his conduct; and thus his first attendance at the Passover, was much the same thing to a Jewish youth as confirmation and first communion is with us.

We may in some faint degree imagine what the effect of a first visit to Jerusalem and the Temple would be on a mind like that of Jesus. No doubt it would receive a sudden and impetuous development as He gazed for the first time on those awful rites which could be solemnised nowhere else, and which He had never seen before; those rites which prefigured what He Himself in a few years more was to do and suffer. A boy of twelve in the burning climate of Palestine was almost as much advanced towards maturity as a youth of sixteen or seventeen would be in our colder region, and, in the enjoyment of legal responsibility for his actions, would be necessarily allowed much liberty. It was therefore, not wonderful that the parents of Jesus should suppose He was somewhere amongst the large numbers that composed their caravan, and should not have been uneasy when He did not at once appear on their journey home. But when a day elapsed and they could not find Him amongst their kinsfolk and acquaintance in the caravan, they turned back to Jerusalem seeking for Him. Now in this exceedingly natural account there is one thing to which they seem at the time to have been blind; and that is, their own grievous culpability. Having been apprised of the immense importance of the life committed to their charge, they ought not to have left the city without making sure of Jesus being with them. And their fault was the more grievous, because their carelessness was probably due to His very virtues, to His extreme docility, and the obedience He had always paid them. Had He been self-willed and headstrong, they would have paid more attention to His safety, they would have watched over Him more closely.

After a day's search we may well suppose, in a state of agonised suspense, they found Him in the Temple, in the midst of the doctors of the law, both hearing them and asking them questions.

The celebrated picture of Holman Hunt gives a very truthful conception of the scene, though not, as it seems to me, of the character of Jesus. In order to understand it you must represent to yourselves, not the enormous Temple courts, surrounded with colonnades, and traversed by a busy multitude of worshippers and money-changers, and sellers of doves for the offerings of the poor—a kind of half-religious, half-secular lounge to dwellers in Jerusalem, who went up to the Temple to meet each other, and talk over business quite as much as to pray, using the Temple as an exchange quite as much as a place of worship. Leaving these spacious courts we must enter one of the side edifices, where were numerous chambers of various sizes, often used in much the same way as the lecture-halls of our old Universities. For learning has ever been associated with religion in the East; and to this day the great mosques at Cairo and Constantinople are the Universities of Egypt and of Turkey.

In such a room, then, seated on the ground, as the custom then was for learners, whilst the doctors of the law sate on the raised dais or divan running round the room, they found Jesus; not teaching them, as the story is often misconceived, but listening respectfully, and questioning them, as learners in those days were encouraged to do. For a great part of the written code of modern Judaism consists of the answers given to disciples by their teachers and the doctors of the Law. That Jesus should have gone to the Temple we need not wonder. His mind would naturally receive a prodigious impetus on this His first attendance at the greatest Jewish Feast, when for the first time He felt His personal responsibility for the fulfilment of the Law; first became fully conscious of His dignity as a citizen of the Jewish State: and when to this natural stimulus we add the mental peculiarities belonging to one absolutely unique in the history of man, we cannot feel the least surprised that it was in the Temple His anxious parents at length discovered Him; indeed, the only thing to excite surprise is that they should have ever sought Him elsewhere. Yet this is only another instance of the general truth that no man is a prophet in his own country; that a man's or a boy's own near relations are often precisely those who least understand his bent and anticipate his future greatness.

All that were listening to Him, we are told, were astonished at His understanding and His answers. We may well believe that He who, when a man of thirty, spake as never man spake, should, as a boy of twelve, comprehend and answer far beyond the average of adolescent intelligence. But there is one thing in this brief narrative that strikes us mournfully. It was the only occasion on which the Lord had to do with the teachers of His people without exciting their animosity. The deference of a learner towards those who sate in Moses' seat, and whose instructions He afterwards bade His disciples on that account to venerate and accept, would leave untouched as yet their jealous pride of place; but as soon as the long meditations of His own heart, and the measureless inspiration of the Spirit, had fitted Him to be the Teacher of teachers, the Master of masters, the scribes and doctors, in the company of some of whom He may have probably have sate on this His first visit to His Father's house, could no longer brook Him whose intelligence had then excited their pleased astonishment. As soon as His character was fully revealed—as soon as the Divine stamp was completely seen—He became a stone of stumbling, a rock of offence: He was despised and rejected by the very men who had spent their whole lives in studying His character beforehand in the Prophets! The child Jesus was welcomed: the man Christ was spurned. And is not this still often carried out in the eagerness with which a half-truth is welcomed—a whole truth rejected?

When His parents saw Him, they were amazed: and His mother said to Him, "Child, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold thy father and I were seeking Thee sorrowing." It is to be carefully remarked that the reproach is put into His mother's mouth. Probably Joseph, aware of the Divine Paternity of his reputed Son, did not assume that full authority over Him which Eastern custom would otherwise make it unnatural not to assert, more particularly over a youth emancipated by his age from maternal control. And this is one of those delicate touches, those hints more powerful than direct assertion, by which the Gospels consentiently bring out the Divine origin of Jesus. Let us further remark how this remonstrance of His mother discloses her forgetfulness of her own and Joseph's duty towards Jesus, and thus incidentally repels the figment of her immaculate conception.

Had she been born without sin, she would not have neglected her Son at the most impressive moment of His early life. But the reply of Jesus puts her behaviour in the proper light. Not a word of reproach for their carelessness: the sorrow they had felt was a sufficient punishment. But surprise He does express at their seeking Him apparently for a whole day in every place save that in which they might most naturally have expected to find Him. "Why were ye seeking me? Wist ye not that the place where I must be is my Father's house?" Observe how He quietly puts aside His mother's mention of His reputed father, Joseph. My Father's house, or premises, as the somewhat vague original might be most adequately translated, My true Father's house is the only place where you could expect to find Me. Note here, the singular clearness with which the Child claims God for His Father, setting the claims of Joseph quietly aside, and the simplicity with which he asserts his Divine origin, as a thing which admitted of no question, and needed to excite no surprise. Yet, strange as it may seem, they understood not the word He

spake to them! They had long since, at and before His birth, received every instruction it was possible to give as to the nature of the Child entrusted to their care: but as nothing had happened since to break the monotony of customary life, they had apparently forgotten who He was and who they were as regarded Him!

It is an impressive and much needed comment on the tremendous power of mere outward circumstances, of habitual action, on the mind! How we are dulled by it to those depths of character, to those dread possibilities of action that lurk in every bosom!

"And He went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subjecting Himself to them;" (no other translation is adequate, the Greek words express continuous and purposed self-subjection). He was subjecting Himself to them voluntarily and of full design, the little outbreak of higher consciousness which for a few days had entranced Him into what might seem forgetfulness of His still imperfect and subordinate position, had passed away; the Divine retired again into the recesses of His heart, to give place for another eighteen years to that silent preparation which was required for His great work. Thirty was the age, before which no priest, though born a priest, could exercise his function: and accordingly the Son of God assumed not His eternal priesthood before that age. Eighteen more years of responsible manhood did He spend in patient subjection to His true and reputed parents in the deep retirement of a small country town. What a contrast to the ebullient forwardness of youth in these days! What a lesson to those who, in dissenting sects, often assume the ministry, with its awful responsibilities, before they are in the eye of the law responsible!—as great a contrast as the words of Isaiah quoted by Matthew to describe our Saviour's action, when at length He did begin to act, present to the noisy demonstrations by which our streets in some places are infested on the pretence of preaching Christ. "He shall not strive nor cry, nor make his voice heard in the streets." Have the organisers of the Salvation Army ever read this text?

The lesson from Christ's long obedience to those so utterly beneath Him, from His long and patient delay before assuming His great office, is particularly needed by all young persons in this restless age. Let them think no scorn to learn from the the Son of God that great things ripen slowly; that if God has given them any special task, He can wait till they are mature and fitted for it; that haste is not the same as speed.

That our Lord attained maturity by the gradual process by which all human beings, perhaps all created beings, grow and thrive, we are expressly told in the last verse of this instructive and pregnant history, for we there learn that Jesus was advancing in wisdom as well as in age or stature, and in favour with God and man. The union of the Divine with the Human in His person did not rob the Human of any of its natural and necessary qualities. Among these growth and advance are some of the most striking, and these, therefore, Jesus exhibited in mind as well as body. In dwelling generally on the Incarnation, we may carry out still farther the principle here exhibited. The Divine Man only gradually learned things, as any other man might do. Much He never knew, doubtless, before He was made perfect through suffering and death. For He emptied Himself, as St. Paul declares, when He took our nature on Him; emptied Himself of every Divine prerogative that would have interfered with His full appreciation of our state and all its imperfections. To invest Him in His earthly career with all the omniscience of the Deity is to contradict the representation of the Gospels. He thought as a child, He understood as a child, whilst He was yet a child; and though when a man He put away childish things, He did not put away those things that pertain to the limitations of manhood; of humanity in itself, as it now exists. Jesus was not a mere man. How, indeed, He could have ever been conceived as such passes my comprehension; but neither was He mere God. And this is the key to many difficulties which modern thought has raised. His knowledge was gradually attained by such methods as are open to men in general; the Spirit which was poured measureless on Him was not the spirit of anticipated scientific discovery or critical research, but the spirit of wisdom and of holiness, of absolute surrender to the Divine Will, of absolute coincidence with the Divine Mind; and therefore we are not to seek in His utterances authoritative decisions on moot points of history or criticism. He pierced at once to the real drift, the eternal significance, of the Old Testament Scriptures, of the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms; but the outer shell, the husk in which that kernel of Divine instruction was wrapped, it was not His province to investigate. Nor may we, therefore, forbid or bias research into its nature and texture by quoting an authority which had nothing to do with these questions, and never really touched them.

I have now done. Let us, my brethren, be not wise above what is written, nor dogmatise away the lessons of obedience, of self-restraint, and self-abnegation; of the only gradual growth of even the Divine in man which this manifestation of the Saviour's character and glory, of His early discipline and slow maturity, presents.

Sir Edwin Chadwick, K.C.B., has subscribed £5 to the Church of England Burial, Funeral and Mourning Reform Association.

To the Deaf.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

NEUTRALITY.

By Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon of Westminster.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, January 19th, 1890.

"No man can serve two masters."—Matt. vi. 24.

MY object in these sermons has been to enable us to know ourselves that we may the better fulfil the solemn exhortation, "Judge, therefore, yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord." When I spoke of innocence, you must all have felt how few of us attain to that high standard of being "the sons of God without rebuke"; and when I spoke of guilt, many of you may have hoped that you at least had not fallen to the lowest class of willing transgressors, of backsliders and reprobates. But do not very many of us belong to that innumerable multitude who are half and half, undecided, neither one thing nor the other? Now, we cannot understand too clearly that God requires a whole heart, an undivided service, a complete self-surrender; and if the result of the thoughts which we pass in review this afternoon be to show us that we are not rendering to God this service, let us look to it, for then we are not walking in the right way, but in that bye-path meadow which leads to spiritual death.

It is fatally easy to deceive ourselves; but "Be not deceived, God is not mocked." It certainly was not to make characters of mere neutrality and compromise, mere mask and veneer, mere semblance and formalism, that Christ died; it was to make heroes, saints, martyrs, at the very least truly good men and truly good women. "Of all unsuccessful men in any shape, whether divine, human, or devilish," says a secular historian, "there is no equal to Bunyan's 'Facing-both-Ways'; the fellow with one eye on heaven and one on earth, who sincerely professes one thing and sincerely does another, and from the intensity of his unreality is unable either to see or feel the contradiction; he is substantially trying to cheat both God and the devil, and in reality only cheating himself and his neighbours. This of all characters upon the earth appears to us to be one of which there is no hope at all—a character becoming in these days alarmingly abundant." Now, no one who has learned the lesson of the Gospel will say of any character that there is no hope for it at all. But it is true that this class of characters, the unconscious hypocrites, the insincere professors, the Mr. Anythings, are hardest of all to deal with. It was from this class that came the deadliest enemies of Christ—the priests and Pharisees, who thought themselves the only respectable people of that day. "As must invariably happen to men living in such conventionalities," says another lay theologian, "over the whole inert stagnation of their souls there grew a scurf of feeble corruption. Petty vices, littlenesses, meannesses were rife within them, until at last there appeared nothing to mark the religious man but superficial respectability, worn like a cloak of deception over a multitude of sins." Now, it is surely most important that we should thoroughly recognise this fatally common type of character, otherwise we shall never be able to tell whether it is our own character. And the issue of our thoughts should be to roll over in tones of thunder the solemn question, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; if Baal, then follow him."

Let us, then, consider this afternoon, first, the characteristics of neutrality; next, its causes; and, lastly, its issue.

Scripture will help us to observe *its characteristics*. Scripture is full of indications of the peril and shame of this compromise. It shows us the Samaritans, who feared the law and served their graven images; and its Israelites, who sacrificed to God and yet took up the Tabernacle of Moloch and the star of their God Remphan; and its priests and people, who would fain have made an agreement with death and a covenant with hell; and its Laodiceans, to whom the spirit said in strong loathing, "Oh! that thou wert either cold or hot. So, then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." And if we would see individual specimens of the class, we see them in Balaam, praying to die the death of the righteous, yet seduced by the bribes of the wicked; and in Pilate, thinking that by washing his hands he could wash off from his conscience the crimson stain; and in the young ruler who, entangled in the cares of this world through meanness, made the great refusal, and called forth the solemn warning of Jesus by going away sorrowful because he had great possessions. And Scripture being thus full of warnings, the significance of those warnings has not been lost upon the great Christian teachers. They have not failed to observe that to this class of colourless neutrals belong, alas! the immense majority of the Christian world. Take, for instance, that mightiest of Christian teachers, the poet Dante. When he has passed through the black and rocky Gate of Hell, he comes to a region where horrible outcries, tones of anguish, accents of rage, voices deep and hoarse, and smitten hands make a tumult which sounds through that turbid and murky air. He asks Virgil who those wretches were, and he is told that they are the dreary souls of those who have lived, indeed, without infamy, yet without praying, mingled with the caitiff crew of angels who were neither rebels against God nor faithful to Him, but were only for themselves. Heaven chased them forth because they would have soiled her beauty; hell itself spurns them as even more despicable than the wicked; the world has forgotten their blind, greedy, nameless, selfish lives. Mercy and justice alike disdain them; so,

he says, they swept for ever round the uttermost confines of Hell in numbers so numberless that he could not have believed that Death could have undone so many, and they follow the greedy fluttering of the sooty flock of Acheron—a crew of caitiffs hateful to God and to His enemies, abject, naked, stung by wasps and hornets, and their faces smeared with blood and tears. Could there be a more scornful picture of those who are dead but have never lived, the selfishly neutral, the greedily callous in the great unceasing conflict between good and evil, the trimmers and the shufflers, the half-and-half people, who do not care for duty, but who care for what pays, who do not care for the approbation of God, but for what the world says, or who, having sold themselves for the indulgence of their meanest vices, are condemned to punishments as mean and paltry as their lives.

Turn to another great teacher—John Bunyan. His illustration of this vileness of compromise is taken from one of the commonest of its causes, the love of money, for which men sell their souls as much as for sensual passions. It is the emblem of the Man with the Muck Rake, who could look no way but downwards, raking to himself the straws, the small sticks, and the dust of the floor, while the shining angel proffers to him in vain the celestial crown. Then said Christiana, "Oh, deliver me from this Muck Rake!" "That prayer," said the Interpreter, "has lain by until it is almost rusted. 'Give me not riches' is scarce the prayer of one in ten thousand; straws, sticks, and dust, with most are the great things now looked after." The Man with the Muck Rake, observe, has not been guilty of any great crime; he has not been an extortioner, unjust, an adulterer, only like Dives and the rich fool in the parables of our Lord, he has lived in greedy selfishness, absorbed in eager money-grubbing, caring only for this world's treasure, indifferent except in name to the life beyond. We find everywhere and under all sorts of conditions this blight of neutrality, compromise, inoperative principle, insincere religion. It does not, as to-day's Epistle teaches us to do, "abhor that which is evil and cleave to that which is good," but, on the contrary, leans now to the one and now to the other, and in its precincts good and evil are not wrestling as they should be, shoulder to shoulder, in an irreconcilable antagonism, but they are feebly walking together, hand in hand, in futile amity; and it is because of this insincerity, this uncertainty of choice, that millions of souls are not shipwrecked, not shattered by storm or battle, but simply founder in smooth seas, because of the worm or the dry rot in the timber.

But, secondly, since we have seen the characteristics, what are *the causes* of these deplorable attempts at double-mindedness, this endeavour in the worst sense to make the best of both worlds—this double-mindedness? The causes are mainly two. The first is indolence and unbelief. On the one hand, men do not try to grapple with the problem of their own faith. Finding it inconvenient to their aims and desires, they content themselves with the thing they call Agnosticism, which often means nothing in the world except that they will not trouble themselves to make up their own minds about questions which of all others are the most tremendous and the most pressing. The other and no less fatal form of this infidelity is that which professes God with the lips, but denies Him in the heart; which goes on year after year with a languid and frequent reiteration of awful truths, and yet thinks to cheat God by outward orthodoxy and respectable conformity. "If I were to add anything to the supplications of the Prayer Book," says a living preacher, "I would add this: From all paralysing cant of an unfelt devotion, from all that God-defying hypocrisy of an unlifted voice and a down-hanging arm, from all the miserable mummery of a grand external ritual and a selfish and un-Christian like life, good Lord deliver us!" Oh, let us look to it, my friends, that our religion be sincere! Do not think that observances or orthodoxies ever can be anything but a curse to any man if he think to palm them off upon God in the place of truthfulness, justice, purity, unselfishness. Of the Pharisees who thus thought to make a compromise with lives of deepest duty, and for a pretence made long prayers, did not the Lord of Glory Himself say: "Therefore ye shall receive greater judgment." No religion at all is better than one which is but a cloak of maliciousness, or has the whiteness which conceals a sepulchre; which is a mere dissimulation of what a man's real state is, and a mere simulation of what it is not.

But of every form of neutrality and of hypocrisy, whether conscious or unconscious, the worst and commonest cause is some besetting sin, some bosom transgression which seems to have become part and parcel of the very nature. Deep was the insight of that holy poet in his famous lines—

> Lord, with what care hast Thou begirt us round!
> Parents first season us, then schoolmasters
> Deliver us to laws, they send us bound
> To rules of reason; holy messengers,
> Pulpits and Sundays, sorrow dogging sin,
> Afflictions, sordid anguish of all sizes,
> Fine nets and stratagems to catch us in,
> Bibles laid open, millions of surprises,
> Blessings beforehand, ties of gratefulness,
> The sound of glory ringing in our ears;
> Without, our shame; within, our consciences;
> Angels and grace, eternal hopes and fears;
> Yet all these fences and their whole array
> One cunning bosom sin drives quite away.

How many millions of sinners would try to become servants of God but for one thing! With one man it is drink, with another man it is gold, with another it is envy, hatred, or refusal to forgive; with others it is impurity. And thinking that they can give the rest of their heart to God, men try to reserve this one dark corner, this one secret chamber of unhallowed imagery for their own

idolatry. They want to do what they know is very wicked, and cast about for ways to reconcile this wickedness, if not with duty, at least with generous religiousness. By subterfuges, by palliations, by religious shams, by desperate self-deceit they lull their consciences so as to go on in a course of wickedness with less disturbance. They stultify the risings of remorse by merely conditional and partial repentances. They will do everything except break the evil habit, except give up the accursed thing. They think that they can retain their hold on God and on prayer in spite of the warning: "If I incline to wickedness in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." They forget that if any man keep the whole law, and yet willingly offend in one point, he is guilty of all; they forget that he who entertains any sin delightfully, it leavens the whole lump of his thoughts, desires, and affections. How stern, yet how deeply true to nature, is that lesson which Shakespeare teaches us when in the splendid Tragedy he represents the adulterous king upon his knees, and makes him cry—

> May one be pardon'd and retain the offence?
> In the corrupted currents of this world
> Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice;
> And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
> Buys out the law: but 'tis not so above;
> There is no shuffling, there the action lies
> In his true nature; and we ourselves compell'd,
> Even to the teeth and forehead of our faults,
> To give in evidence. What then? What rests?
> O wretched state! O bosom black as death!
> O limed soul, that, struggling to be free,
> Art more engag'd!

And so the King, conscious that

> His words fly up, his thoughts remain below;
> Words without thoughts never to heaven go;

rises from his knees only to plunge in blacker and more deliberate sins.

O miser, selling thy soul for money! O cheating tradesman! O votary of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life! O boy, who forgettest the guide of thy youth and forsakest the covenant of thy God! O young man, defiling thy soul with wilful sins, thou canst not "be pardoned and retain the offence," thou canst not have thy mess of pottage and thy birthright also! "He that washeth himself after the touching of a dead body," says the son of Sirach, "if he toucheth it again, what availeth his washing?" So it is with the man who fasteth for his sins, and goeth again and doeth the same—who will hear his prayer? It needs not to go for illustration to theory or literature; we may find it in experience. I doubt not that hundreds of you have found something like it in some form or other in the personal experiences of your own lives. Does not St. Augustine himself tell us, in his terrible Confessions, that in his unconverted days he used indeed to pray to God to deliver him from lusts of the flesh, but he prayed with the great desire that God would not hear him yet, because he still desired to live in their base indulgence? Can such prayers be heard?

> Had I a throne above the rest,
> Where angels and archangels dwell,
> One sin unslain within my breast,
> Would make that heaven as dark as hell.

My friends, here you may lay the axe at the root of all despicable, half-and-half, neither-one-thing-nor-the-other lives. If you feel that yours is such a life, that you are trying to cheat God and to deceive yourself, and to lull your own conscience by thus trifling with the laws of God, look well whether there be not some besetting sin which you will not give up. And if this be not the cause of the hypocrisy, and if it be, recall those most solemn and most awful words of Christ: "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into Gehenna; and if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; it is good for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into the Gehenna of fire."

For, lastly, what is *the end of a life* which is thus only half sincere? Terrible to say, it can only end in one thing, unless it be broken off and abandoned, and that one thing is spiritual death. "She that liveth in pleasure," says Scripture, "is dead while she liveth." Are there no such living dead here? The dead who have died lie in hundreds beneath us. May there not be hundreds of the dead who are living all around us? The poet saw in the lowest hell the soul of the Prior Elbrigo, and was amazed because he knew that the man was still alive; but when he asks for explanation he receives the awful answer that sometimes a man seems to live above, and eat, and drink, and sleep, and put on clothes, but in reality his soul is sunk down even in his lifetime into the abyss; he has become that most fearful kind of ghost—not a soul without a body, but a body without a soul. Once when an American statesman had committed for ambitious ends what many regarded as a great act of apostacy from his own highest convictions, a poet wrote of him:

> So fallen, so lost, the light withdrawn which once he wore,
> The glory from his grey hairs gone for evermore;
> All else is gone, from those great eyes the light is fled;
> When faith is lost, when honour dies—the man is dead.

My friends, says one, do you remember the old Scythian custom, when the head of the house died, how he was dressed in his finest dress and set in his chariot, and carried about to his friends' houses, and each of them placed him at his table's head and feasted before him? Supposing it were offered to you in plain words as it is offered to each of you in dire facts, that you should gain this Scythian honour gradually while you thought yourselves alive, that you should be suffered to your heart's content to make as much money as you like, and to indulge

yourself to the utmost in the gratification of your most evil passions, to follow your own heart's lusts, having a name only to live while you were dead, would you take the offer verbally made you by the death angel? Would the meanest among us take it, think you? Yet practically and freely we grasp at it, every one of us; in a measure, many of us grasp at it in the fulness of its horror. We choose the death of worldliness, we choose the death of carnal passions; we refuse the life in Christ. Oh, if you would live, if you would choose life and not death, decide, and decide now! Besides the peril of hideous and flagrant rebellion against God's law, there is scarcely less peril in the slight, slow deterioration wrought in us by trying to secure two ends, to serve two masters; to be at once worldly and religious, to be at once fond of money and faithful to God, to be at once pure in theory and impure in life, to act as though we were religious, yet to make reservations in our allegiance to our Creator.

I have tried to show you that in this Ananias-like keeping back of part of the Christ there is a fatal insincerity which leads to a blighted, a despicable life: none the less blighted though men call it successful, none the less despicable though the world applaud it. Will you thus let your souls rot to sleep into the grave? or will you wait until the horrible moment when the Satan, whom in heart and in life, though not in profession, you serve, claims you openly as his bond slave? In one of the most powerful romances of modern days, "The Scarlet Letter" of Nathaniel Hawthorne, a Puritan minister, with deep sin on his soul, living in all the odour of sanctity, is, as a natural consequence, confronted constantly with terrible temptations. A strange, wicked, half-crazed old woman who has the reputation of a witch has, by some secret intuition, read his guilty secret. "And let me tell thee in thy ear," she says, "when the black man sees one of his own servants signed and sealed so shy of owning to the bond he hath a way of ordering matters so that the mark should be disclosed in open daylight to the eyes of all the world." Ah! friends that recognition may or may not come in this life: but how if it come with fearful awakening in the world to come? Oh, shake off at once and for ever this miserable life of unreality! Give up this shameful attempt to deceive God by semblances of shams! Be not like that Dead Salt Sea, of which it has been said that it reflects heaven on its surface and hides Gomorrah in its heart! Do not think that you can enjoy the pleasures of sin and yet be a child of God; do not think that you "can serve two masters." Decide now, and decide for Christ. Pray, pray with all your hearts, and strive, strive with all your might, to be delivered; for either praying, so it be sincere, will make you leave off sinning, or sinning will make you leave off praying. "And now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation." "To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1890.

ANGLO-ISRAELISM.

FOR many years past a growing interest in the question of the identity and present whereabouts of the lost Ten Tribes of Israel has been making itself felt in the minds of a not inconsiderable section of the community; and the belief that in the British nation are to be found the descendants of Israel of old is perhaps more widely spread than we are at first disposed to imagine. We have noticed of late in more than one instance that this belief has fastened itself on the minds of men, while they themselves were almost unconscious of it; and we could not have a clearer sign than this, that the subject of Anglo-Israelism, as it is popularly called, has secured for itself a sure foothold amongst the many and varying topics of religious thought and inquiry which engage the attention of the thinking men of the day. Whatever may be our own views on this question, there can be no doubt that it is one of paramount importance for every student of Holy Writ to settle either one way or the other in his own mind. The great question of the interpretation of prophecy is the pivot on which the whole inquiry turns, and for that very reason it becomes a most fascinating and engaging subject of investigation to every thoughtful reader of God's Word. The tendency in these days on the part of clergy, Nonconformist ministers, and Christian teachers generally is undoubtedly to lay great and often undue stress on the spiritual interpretation of prophecy, to the total neglect of the literal. Let us not be misunderstood; we do not for a moment undervalue the spiritual interpretation, nor do we deny that every prophecy has its spiritual as well as its literal

significance, for we believe that the entire system of the universe, as it reveals the creating, guiding, and controlling hand of God in things both material and spiritual, seen and unseen, is one beautiful harmonious whole, in which are woven together part and counterpart, type and antitype, shadow and substance. But we do take exception to the custom so much in vogue amongst us of treating prophecy by wholesale methods, and taking it for granted that because it is prophecy therefore it has a spiritual meaning, and a spiritual meaning only. It is the Anglo-Israelite's boast that he takes the divine predictions as to Israel and Judah to mean just what they say, while at the same time he sets perhaps a higher value than most men on the spiritual interpretation, because he feels he has a solid literal basis on which to build it up and make it complete. To take the spiritual meaning and neglect the literal is like painting a picture in which there is nothing but background; such a painting, however important its subject, can never be complete until a foreground is added. It is evident from what has been said that we have no sympathy with those who decry the Anglo-Israel Belief as one unworthy of even the smallest consideration, and who look upon the Anglo-Israelite as a man labouring under some harmless delusion, and on that account to be pitied. Any subject of belief, if founded on the convictions of calm, thoughtful men, may reasonably demand a fair hearing for itself. We also deprecate the summary manner in which others dispose of this question by asking, *Cui bono?* The reply is not far to seek: If England be Israel, then England shall be the possessor of the blessings promised to Israel, blessings which bring with them heavy responsibilities, for the one inevitably involves the other.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor," February, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

We are very glad to see that there will be yet another article by the late Bishop of Durham after the one in this number of the *Expositor*. In this month's, Bishop Lightfoot treats of the thorough acquaintance with Jewish manners and feeling which S. John's Gospel shows. Taking the Messianic hopes as an example, he shows that S. John's Gospel indicates perfect acquaintance with Jewish expectations, not confusing them with Christian explanations of prophecy, an error into which a second-century writer could hardly have helped falling. For instance, Jewish opinion drew a distinction between *the* prophet (Deut. xviii. 15) and the Messiah; S. John's Gospel observes, though it does not draw attention to, the distinction. "The point especially to be observed," says Bishop Lightfoot, "is, that the form which the conception [of the prophet] takes is strictly Jewish, and not Christian. Christian teachers identified the prophet foretold by Moses with our Lord Himself, and therefore with the Christ. This application of the prophecy is made directly in S. Peter's speech (Acts iii. 22), and inferentially in S. Stephen's (Acts vii. 37), and later Christian teachers followed in their steps. But these Jews in S. John's Gospel conceive *the* Christ and *the* prophet as two different persons. If he is not the Christ, they adopt the alternative that he may be the prophet (John i. 21, 25); if not the prophet, then the Christ (John vii. 40). It is hardly conceivable to my mind that a Christian writer, living in or after the middle of the second century, calling on his imagination for facts, should have divested himself so absolutely of the Christian idea and fallen back on the Jewish."

Professor Sanday has an exceedingly interesting paper, "*In Memoriam*, Dr. Edwin Hatch," whom he describes as "one of those whose minds do not simply move in the old grooves, but who enrich the age in which they live as much by the questions which they start as those which they solve." Dr. Hatch was a Birmingham—King Edward's School boy. "What Shrewsbury," says Dr. Sanday, "has been for scholarship, that—and in its proportion even more—has King Edward's School, Birmingham, been for Theology." Dr. Hatch's life was a very marvel of intellectual work, wrought out with more zeal than discretion. "His daily exercise," we are told, "did not extend beyond his walks backwards and forwards to the Bodleian and the Faculties Office." No man can stand such a life.

Mr. Gillies writes a very interesting paper, which reads like a sermon with a new introduction, on "Jehovah Resting." It is a very good sermon.

Professor Agar Beet heads his article "The Universal Purpose of Salvation"; he should have headed it, "The Alleged," etc., for he immediately proceeds to show that there is no such purpose revealed in Scripture. It is a temperately-written paper, and that, considering the subject, is saying a great deal.

Other papers are by Dr. Dykes, Dr. Lumby, and Professor Bruce, making a much better number of the *Expositor* than last month's.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

Sir,—It is only this day I have read Mr. Donaldson's letter in the Pulpit of the 1st inst., and though I do not mean again to go over the entire question of ultimate salvation for all, I purpose to mention some not generally noticed arguments on that side.

Eternal death is never mentioned in Holy Scripture, even when the symmetry of the sentence appears to require it. See Rom. ii. 7-8: "To them that by patience in well doing seek for glory and honour and incorruption, eternal life; but unto them that are factious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation, and anguish." Also Gal. vi. 8: "He that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life."

The word κόλασις occurs only twice in the New

Testament, and in the Revised Version is in both places translated by *punishment* — namely, Matt. xxv. 46 "(The unmerciful) shall go into eternal punishment;" and 1 John iv. 18. "There is no fear in love, but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath punishment; and he that feareth is not made perfect in love." κόλασις literally or etymologically, signifies *pruning* (see John xv. 2, where *cleanse* is used in the sense of *prune*); thence it came to mean punishment in the sense of *chastisement*, in which sense it is unquestionably used in 1 John iv. 18, where any thought of vindictive punishment would be altogether out of place—the old translation *torment* is obviously quite wrong. If, then, in the one place the word is used in its etymological sense, there is at least a presumption, though not a certainty, that it is used in the same sense in the other place.

In the parable with which St. Matthew concludes his account of the Lord's teaching, the condemned are called *goats*. Now, Christ calls Himself a Shepherd, and to a shepherd the goats are only less dear than the sheep. Had He described men destined to absolutely hopeless wrath under the parable of animals, He would much more naturally have called them wolves or vipers.

Further, the original has not *goats* but *kids*—a word of endearment. This is marked in the margin of the Revised Version, but why is it not in the text? Is not this word meant to suggest that sins of careless and thoughtless inhumanity, which are the only ones dealt with in this parable, are sins of immaturity, and shall be healed and outgrown in the future life?

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 8th February, 1890.

SIR,—Mr. Sandlands, in remarking on my short letter in this day week's PULPIT, says that Universalist writers have the word atonement, but that the substance is wanting; by which I take him to mean, that those writers' view of the doctrine of Atonement is erroneous, or that they reject it while employing the term. Mr. Sandlands says also that he did not know that there are any Universalist writers. If so, he must be unacquainted with their writings, and therefore cannot know what their views are. I beg to submit that I, who am acquainted with a good deal of the literature in question, am a better witness than he, who is not so acquainted; and I assert, not only of the two authors that I referred to, but of several others, that they do teach the doctrine of Atonement.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

8th February, 1890.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM AND THE BISHOP OF ARGYLE.

SIR,—Hagenbach in his "History of Doctrines" says that "it is a remarkable fact which, however, admits of a satisfactory solution, that Augustine entertained milder views on this point than Pelagius, who, *as well as Chrysostom, maintained the eternal duration of the punishments of hell in accordance with his strict doctrine of moral retribution.*" And goes on to add, "we might have expected that the milder disposition of Chrysostom would have induced him to adopt opinions more in accordance with those of his master, Diordorus of Tarsus. But his position in the Church, and the general corruption of morals, compelled him to adopt more rigid views" and gives as an instance of this latter the following quotation: μὴ τῇ μελλήσει παραμυθώμεθα ἑαυτούς, ὅταν γὰρ πάντως δεῇ γενέσθαι, οὐδὲν ἡ μελλήσις ὠφέλει. Similar sentiments are to be found in his "Epistles" and "Homilies." This quite nullifies any influence his language might have when he "thanks God for Gehenna," supposing this latter expression to bear the meaning imputed to it by "J.B." But out of it can be taken the meaning that though men are not always drawn to the practice of virtue by the glories of heaven, they may, nevertheless, be deterred from the practice of vice by the fear of the torments of Gehenna. The fear of these torments may be their first step to the practice of virtue, like, as it is said, "the fear of the Lord (his punishments) is the beginning of wisdom." When Chrysostom says "God is equally to be praised when He chastises and when He frees from chastisement," the sentence does not tell us on account of which we are to "give thanks for Gehenna;" but to refer it to the former would be more in accordance with the prevailing disposition of his mind as brought to light in the above extract. And had the thought been crystallised in his mind that all men would be finally restored to happiness, he would hardly have been so inconsistent with himself as to pray, "Grant us in this world knowledge of thy truth and in the world to come life everlasting." "Little knowledge is a dangerous thing;" "drink deep, or touch not the Pierian springs," is a wholesome advice all round; and yet it does not appear to have been much attended to by the Bishop of Argyle when he penned that wonderful sentence: "Hell is not endless, but the way to righteousness." What is this sentiment but the offspring of the ignorance of Scripture. Taking Scripture for our guide we cannot but pronounce it to be absolutely untrue. Unfortunately there are too many like the Bishop, who, forgetful or ignorant of the first principles of theology, jump to conclusions revolting to common sense. Let us attend to one or two of these first principles.

It is admitted that man is capable of living endlessly. Had he not sinned he would have lived on in endless happiness; the fact that he has sinned has not deprived him of this power. Had no Saviour come he would have lived on in endless misery. How does the coming of the Saviour modify this circumstance? It does not take away this power; but God says, "*Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" from endless misery by being put in possession of endless happiness. The endlessness is the same in both cases, only the *quality* of the life is changed. There is no *medium* course between endless torment and endless happiness. By securing the one we avoid the other, and by avoiding the one we secure the other. Man brought endless misery on himself; God devised a plan by which he could escape that misery. If man does not adopt the plan, then God simply leaves him to that endless misery he brought on himself. The endlessness in both cases is unalterable, and arises out of a fundamental principle in the constitution of man's spiritual nature. But what is the plan? We had it above, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Faith and salvation stand here in the relation of the *condition* and the *conditioned*, so that if the condition be not performed, the conditioned cannot come. This is another first principle; and our blessed Lord beautifully explained it in one of the earliest lessons He gave to the sons of men. "*As* Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even *so* must the son of man be lifted up; that *whosoever believeth* in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." Mark the "as" and the "so" and apply. Every

bitten Israelite who *looked* was healed, and everyone who did not look was not healed; so everyone who looks by faith to Christ shall be saved, and everyone who looks not shall not be saved. And as the lifting up of the serpent was *sufficient* to cure every bitten Israelite, yet it did not cure him unless he looked; so, though the lifting up of Christ on the cross be a "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world," yet it will save no man, except the man who looks to Him by faith. If God was *determined* by all means to save every bitten Israelite, why did He affix any condition at all? And if He was determined thus to save them, why not *compel* them to the performance of the condition? He will not *force* his salvation on any man: nor will He compel any man to believe any more than He compelled the bitten Israelite to look at the serpent. How marvellous it is to find a person making statements so contradictory of such plain teaching of Scripture as was done by Mr. Murphy in your issue of the 25th inst, when he said "there is no sin which can remain ultimately undestroyed and unhealed" (either *with* faith or *without* it). but simply because Christ made a sufficient atonement for the sins of the world!

"God shall be all in all" to those who shall have been saved by faith in Christ; which shall take place when "all enemies shall have been put under the feet of Christ," including the "devil, the beast, and the false prophet," who shall then have been "cast into the lake of fire and brimstone to be tormented for ever and ever," together with all "those whose names shall not be found written in the Lamb's book of life."

That the faith which is the condition of salvation cannot be performed in hell is evident from the fact that it cannot be performed without the help of God's grace; but this is not to be found there, because there is nothing there but "tribulation and anguish, indignation and wrath"—"wrath without mixture." Those unhappy people are banished from the gracious "presence of the Lord," and from "His glorious power" which He exercises in saving human souls.

That it must be exercised in *time* is evident from our "appearing at the Judgment-seat of Christ; that everyone may receive the things *done in his body* according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." If faith, therefore, be not exercised while "in the body," it cannot be exercised at all in order to salvation. What now becomes of the monstrous assertion that "hell is the way to righteousness?" But further, the "things done in the body" include the things mentioned by our blessed Lord in Matt. xxv. 41-43, according to which the sentence at the Judgment-day will be pronounced: "For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick and in prison, and ye visited me not." As these things can be performed *only* when people are "in the body," it follows that the sentence, in accordance with verses 44-46, must be irrevocable.

Before I close this letter I would like to draw attention to one sentence of "J. B.'s" in his letter to the PULPIT of the 18th inst. He says, "The question I have attempted to bring forward is not whether men die happy or unhappy, but whether at the close of life they are prepared for a safe, holy, and happy immortality." A person blessed with ordinary intelligence would find it difficult to perceive a difference between *dying happy* and of being "*prepared* at the *close of life* for a *happy* immortality." This confusion in language arises from confusion of thought, and this again from misconception of Scripture teaching. "Universalism" is built on nothing else.

R. DONALDSON.

January 28th, 1890.

THE LATE DR. LITTLEDALE.

SIR,—There is a letter in your paper of to-day censuring some works of the late Dr. Littledale. For Canon Crosthwaite to attribute to a man like Dr. Littledale "childish twaddle" is ridiculous. For a writer to say that *phantasm* and *accident* mean the same is but to expose his ignorance of the English language. For one who only learned a few days ago that King Edward's first Service book forbade elevation of the elements at the celebration of the Eucharist—this is enough to put him at once out of court as any authority. Criticism of interesting books and pamphlets, that is real criticism, is valuable; such criticism as we have in the letter of to-day is quite the reverse.

B.

8th February, 1890.

ST. JOHN VI.

SIR,—As your correspondent, Edmund Lawrence, asserts that I have tried to narrow the question, and has therefore declined "to discuss the subject on these lines," I must, in self defence say, that he has not answered my question in any of his letters. My question was simply this, and I leave it to any of your readers to judge whether it is a fair one or not; Did the Bread which our Lord called His Flesh, and which He said He would give for the life of the world, come down from heaven? (St. John vi. 51.)

In a former letter I endeavoured to show that two different breads are spoken of in this chapter—the Living Bread, viz., Himself, and the Bread, viz., His Flesh, which He gave for the life of the world. This distinction does not contradict, though Edmund Lawrence says it does, our Lord's words. A passage (1 Cor. x. 4) occurs to me, in which "drinking of (ἐκ) that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ," is almost parallel with the one in question. Will any one say that the Rock, and that which came from the Rock, are the same? My object is to find out the truth, and if Edmund Lawrence can give me no assistance, I trust others of your readers will do so.

INQUIRENS.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—In my last letter I pointed out some of Dr. Hobart's most palpable errors (as they seemed to me), in which he mistakes phrases taken from the Septuagint by the Jewish writer of the Third Gospel for evidences of professional medical knowledge. I should like here to say that while I venture to point out his errors, I cannot but recognise the laborious research which Dr. Hobart has embodied in his interesting book.

I now turn to the index of Dr. Hobart's book. In this I find 415 entries. Of these 313 are marked as being peculiar to St. Luke's writings. There are thus

102 words *not* peculiar to them—that is, they occur in some other part of the New Testament; but, nevertheless, Dr. Hobart considers them as signs of medical training in the writer of the Acts. If so, surely they would equally prove medical knowledge in the other New Testament writers who use them. Now, I find that besides occurring elsewhere in the New Testament, all but four of these 102 words occur in the Septuagint (including the Apocrypha), and consequently formed part of the natural vocabulary of every devout and intelligent Jew, consequently of the author of the Acts. Need I add a single syllable more on this point? I think not.

There remains, however, an (apparently) very formidable array of words marked in Dr. Hobart's Index as *peculiar* to the Third Gospel and the Acts. These are 313 in number, but are easily and fairly reduced to about 310 (ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνος, for instance, properly appears *twice* in the index, under the heading of *each* of the two words; but though the phrase is peculiar to St. Luke, neither of the two words forming it is peculiar to him). Now does not the fact that 310 words used by the medical writers are to be found in the Third Gospel and the Acts alone among the New Testament Scriptures triumphantly prove that the author of the Third Gospel must have been a medical man? No, I reply, not at all. How can it possibly prove this when there are at least 660 words peculiar to Luke and Acts (*excluding* the 150 proper names peculiar to the Acts). Dr. Hobart's list does not amount to even one-half the words peculiar to the writer. If the writer of the Acts was, indeed, as Dr. Hobart asserts, a physician, and so wholly a physician as to be constrained to think and write medically even on non-medical matters, why does he employ in his narrative 350 words peculiar to himself, in which even Dr. Hobart's microscopic eye fails to detect the slightest *soupcon* of medical colouring? Even the whole number of words in Dr. Hobart's Index (including the 100 in round numbers which he admits occur in other parts of the New Testament, and which, as I have said, occur also in the Septuagint), even all the 415 words in Dr. Hobart's Index are as a mere drop in the ocean compared with the whole number of words used by the educated, observant, travelled writer of the Acts, who discourses so intelligently on such numerous and such various topics. The author of the Third Gospel and the Acts uses about 2,750 words. What are 415 words out of such a host?—not one in six. How, then, can Dr. Hobart talk of "the medical bias in the diction of the general narrative," and assert that "the prevailing tinge of medical diction permeates the entire works, and shows the hand of a medical author continuously from the first verse of the Gospel to the last of the Acts of the Apostles"? Do 415 words out of a total of 2,750 words (350 of these latter being, although peculiar to the writer, without the slightest medical tinge) justify such a statement? But more crushing still is the fact that of the 310 words marked by Dr. Hobart as peculiar to St. Luke, *all but* 59 *are to be found in the Septuagint*—proving, as I am never tired of repeating, that *the author of the Acts was a* JEW.

There are thus (adding the four words mentioned at the beginning of this letter) *only* 63 words *altogether* in Dr. Hobart's Index which are not to be found in Schleusner's Lexicon of the Septuagint. Now, if Dr. Hobart can show that even this meagre residuum of 63 words is in any sense *peculiar* to the medical writers, he might still have some slight and slender foundation for his thesis. But this is not so. Many of them are ordinary words used in the usual way. Speaking broadly, all these words are to be found in the ordinary Greek (non-medical) writers. Will it be credited that of these 63 words (as to which I have more to say hereafter) remaining out of the original 415, on which Dr. Hobart built his case, there is but *one*—ONE miserable, solitary word—(and that one wholly unimportant, and used in a non-medical sense) for which the *only* authority is a Greek medical writer? That one word is ἀνωτέρικος (Acts xix. 1); and while ἀνώτερος occurs in Hebrews and Leviticus, I must honestly confess that the only authority which I can find for ἀνωτέρικος is Hippocrates. Is this enough to warrant the conclusion that the writer of the Acts must have been a medical man? An inverted pyramid is not a very stable edifice, being liable at any moment to topple over with a crash for want of a broad and firm foundation. Even so it is with the theory that the author of the Third Gospel was a medical man. With, or indeed without, Dr. Hobart's permission I must positively assert that the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts was *not* a medical man, but a Greek-speaking Jew deeply read in and reverently familiar with the Septuagint Version of his own sacred and treasured Scriptures.

H. HEBER EVANS.

February 6th, 1890.

THE ORNAMENT RUBRIC PUT OUT OF THE IRISH REVISED PRAYER BOOK.

SIR,—When a personal letter is written against one, especially a letter without a name, it is a good rule to reply as courteously as one can. I remember what Hooker answered to Travers, "to personalities I reply nothing—to arguments as follows":—"B" acknowledges that a reason for getting rid of the Ornaments Rubric was, "by some one very absurdly" given, that it was not in the book fetched up from the Rolls office, or wherever it was kept. As I was not in the Synod I could only report what I heard from my late friend Dr. Studdert. Whoever the individual was who gave that reason, he must now thank "B." for calling it "absurd." "B" mentions another reason for its removal. The *Church Times* intensifies this, as it said last week that this Ornaments Rubric makes legal all that Henry VIII. left, that is, all the old Missal and Breviary! "B" is very anxious about Elizabeth, Charles II., and Cromwell. I expressed myself carelessly. All I meant to speak of was the copy produced at our Synod whenever sent over. If "B" wishes to test the point which I put, he can easily do so if he will see the copy produced in our Synod. There *is* a leaf wanting. On this page are the rules for finding Easter on one side, and on the other is the first sentence on the page next before the beginning of our service "The morning and evening prayer shall be used," etc. Is it conceivable that this page with all its contents, was never in the copy sent over for us? But "the catch-word" of the page before the missing leaf, settles the question. It is "to," whereas the first word of the page following the missing leaf, is "the." Could there be stronger proof of the fact "absurdly" denied by some one, who nevertheless, had weight enough to carry our ignorant "*Synodus Latronum*," as Archdeacon Lee called them? I wish "B" would examine the copy shown at the Synod, and explain about "the catch-word" and tell us what he finds.

"B" calls me up for saying that the new question and answer foisted into the Catechism, are falsely described in the New Preface. I repeat my charge, though as it was openly and audaciously done before the world, "foisted" was a wrong word. The New Preface says that both question and answer are taken from the 28th Article, as "the Revision Report" expressly *promised, twice over, that they should be taken*, pp. 12 and 29. But such is not the fact. The question is taken from the Catechism, and the answer alone from the Article. Why was not the question taken from the Article? Because it has the words "given and eaten" which the Revisionists would not use, though they were told by the honest Churchmen in the Synod that if they shrunk from saying that the Body of Christ is given and eaten "only in an heavenly and spiritual manner," Romanists will say that *we dare not* so assert.

"B." says that the real reason why the Ornaments Rubric was left out, was that "it is impossible to tell the proper application of it, and that it has been the source of strife and mischief." I never heard this reason before, but it might just as well be given as it was in the Synod, for the puritanising of the Baptismal and Ordination services, and of every other part that teaches Church doctrines.

Omitting all personalities, I have now answered all in "B.'s." letter.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—To please "B" I have given up the term "foisted," as applied to the introduction of a new question and answer into the Church Catechism. But I retract this admission of mine. "Foisting" is the proper word. What right had we, a poor branch Church, to meddle with the Church Catechism of the whole Anglican Church? What right to introduce a nonsensical question and answer into the Church Catechism? Thus altered, has it any right to the title of the Church Catechism? It is no longer really the work of Andrewes and Bancroft, though it bears their name. We have, as it were, altered a document of agreement between the English and Irish Churches. But this is not all! The new question and answer were drawn up in order to contradict the words of the same Catechism, that the outer part is a means of receiving the inward. This is denied by the new question and answer. Faith is made the sole means, allowing God no means on His side. The introduction is actually heretical. We had a portrait of Vandyke, and stuck a second nose on the face. A friend has now examined the Record Office. He saw a Black-letter Prayer Book of Charles II.'s time. It has the Ornaments Rubric. He also saw a MS. called "the Transmiss." The leaf is wanting. Its loss is proved by the "catch words."

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

ON Tuesday last the Archbishop of York completed his seventy-first year.

THE Convocation of the province of York will meet for the transaction of business on Tuesday, April 15.

WE regret to learn that the Rev. Arthur Robins, of Holy Trinity, Windsor, is seriously ill with a bad attack of congestion of the lungs.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arnold, Rev. H. L, M.A., Vicar of Dereham; Chaplain to the 3rd Volunteer Battalion, Norfolk Regiment.
Benoy, Rev. James, B.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Fulham; Assistant Missioner, St. John's College, Cambridge, Mission in Walworth.
Benwell, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Langton Moor, Lincolnshire.
Bourchier, Rev. William C., M.A., Chaplain to the *Lion*.
Calliphronas, Rev. Theodore, Vicar of Pampisford, Cambridge.
Crosland, Rev. J., L.Th. Durham, Curate-in-Charge; Vicar of Kilham, East Yorkshire.
Edwards, Rev. E., Curate-in-Charge of Manafon; Rector of Dylife, Montgomeryshire.
Goddard, Rev. Cecil Vincent, M.A., Vicar of Chideock, Dorset.
Heseltine, Rev. Ernest, M.A., Curate of Sandringham and West Newton; Rector of Great Cressingham, Norfolk.
Higgins, Rev. Vincent Joseph, Vicar of Awsworth, Nottinghamshire.
Hunt, Rev. John, Curate of St. Thomas's, Camden-town; Chaplain of All Saints', Rouen.
Jackson, Rev. Peter Holmes, M.A., Rector of Patney, Wilts.
Johnson, Rev. John E. S., B.A., Chaplain to the *Cambridge*.
Mason, Rev. John E. S., B.A., Chaplain to the *Warspite*.
Morcom, Rev. W. G., M.A., Vicar of Braunton, North Devon; Vicar of St. Michael's and All Angels', Hackney.
Stantial, Rev. Arthur Evered, Rector of Bacton, Suffolk.
Todd, Rev. Charles J., M.A., Chaplain to the *Mercury*.
Turton, Rev. Zouch Horace, Vicar of St. Mary's, Southtown, Yarmouth.
Vaughan, Rev. Ernest J., M.A., Chaplain to the *Undaunted*.
Walter, Rev. J. Conway, Vicar of the District Church of Langton St. Andrew, Woodhall Spa, Lincoln; Rector of the Parent Church, Langton-by-Horncastle.
Wright, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Rural Dean of Gartree.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alderson, Rev. E. A., Chaplain to the Forces, at Malta, on the 28th ult.
Fullerton, Rev. Charles Garth, M.A., at Thryburg Park, Yorkshire, on the 4th inst., aged 51.
Haigh, Rev. John, M.A., for nearly twenty-one years Vicar of Shirley, Southampton, at 6, Grosvenor Gardens, Tunbridge Wells, on the 6th inst., aged 75.
Hammond, Rev. Robert, M.A., late of Brighton, at Southport, on the 5th inst., aged 73.
Harrison, Rev. James Harwood, Patron, and formerly Rector of Bugbrooke, at Bugbrooke Rectory, on the 7th inst., aged 91.
Heathcote, Rev. Gilbert Vyvyan, Rector of the parish, at West Deeping, on the 8th inst., aged 59.
Image, Rev. William Thomas, M.A., late Vicar of Wickham Market, at 35, Brunswick Gardens, Kensington, on the 9th inst., aged 58.
Palairet, Rev. Richard Thomas, at 16, Bennett Street, Bath, on the 7th inst., aged 84.
Pierpoint, Rev. Matthew Aust, M.A., of Elworthy Rectory, at Staunton Villa, Southsea, on the 30th ult., aged 64.
Poole, Rev. Henry Wilks, M.A., Natural Science Assistant Master at Charterhouse, at Godalming, on the 3rd inst.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FUNERAL SERMON ON RICHARD SOMERS, ESQ.

By the Rev. JAMES HAMILTON, B.A., Rector of Ardnurcher and Kilbeggan, Co. West Meath.

Sermon Preached in the Churches of Ardnurcher and Kilbeggan on Sunday, February 2nd, 1890.

"But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."—1 Thess. iv. 13, 14.

THESE words are taken from the alternate lesson appointed to be read in our Burial Service. And surely no words could be more suitable. They are well adapted to bring comfort and consolation to the mourners who are sorrowing for their loved ones. They are, of course, not capable of drying the tears of natural affection; they are not intended to do so, but they cause them to flow into the channels of faith and hope. It is not wrong to shed those sacred tears freely and abundantly. It is quite right and natural, because they tend to unburden and purify the soul. Tears of natural affection have been really consecrated to us by the God-Man, who wept beside the tomb of His friend Lazarus. But although the Christian's sorrow may be abundant, it can never be the bitter wail of despair. It cannot be the lamentation of hopelessness. If we sorrow it is not even as others who have no hope, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."

Of course these words had special reference to the people to whom St. Paul wrote. These Thessalonion Christians had been, we find, much excited concerning the second coming of our Lord. They fancied that the Lord would come in their own time, and therefore they thought that those of their friends who, through Jesus, had died a happy death, were losers by not having lived to witness the Lord's coming. The Apostle then endeavours to set them right on this subject, not by telling them that they had no need to be troubled because Jesus would not come in their day, because he knew not the day nor the hour, but that if they believed in the resurrection of Jesus they were also to believe that when God would bring back Jesus to the world, He would also, with Jesus, bring back those who had fallen asleep in Him. So that those who will be alive on the earth at His second coming will have no advantage over those who died before. Such is Alford's commentary on this passage. But it seems to me that the Apostle had also in his mind the utter hopelessness which existed in the heathen world at that time with regard to the future. Death was truly to the heathen the King of Terrors. And although in the Old Testament the fathers did not merely look for transitory promises, many, no doubt like Abraham, looked for "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and whose maker is God," yet with regard to the teaching of the Book itself it leaves the future life in a great mist. It is unquestionably the Gospel which has brought life and immortality to light. The resurrection of Christ testifies that although death is mighty, he is not the mightiest. At the empty tomb of Jesus we can kindle a hope which the grave can never extinguish. And every first day of the week bears witness that we may comfort one another with the words of the Apostle: "That if Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."

These words of our text have a very solemn pathos coming from this pulpit to-day, because one of our number, who was very dear to us, has just fallen asleep in Jesus. On Sunday, the 12th January, he was worshipping here with us. On the Sunday following he had joined the Church triumphant. He has gone to be with Christ, which is far better. The loss has been to us, the gain to him. Oh, how we shall miss his form amongst us, and the kindly greeting which he had for everybody who came to worship within these walls. For myself, personally, I may say, that although I have scarcely known him two years, his death has made a void in my life. He was so much needed in the world that we cannot understand why it was expedient for the Lord to take him away so soon from amongst us. We do not know now, but we shall know hereafter. God moves through this world in a very mysterious way. His providence is sometimes very dark. At present clouds and darkness are round about Him in His providential dealings. Yet notwithstanding all this, we know and believe in His exceeding great love towards us. Since God so loved the world that He sent out from the darkness His own dear Son to take our nature, to be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, to humbly tread this earth of ours, and then for us on Calvary to die that we might live, however we may be perplexed about His providence, we cannot doubt His love to us. Through Christ we can see as it were up into the very heart of our Father. "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," says Christ. In Christ, God comes very near to us, and we draw very near to God. We may sometimes imagine that on account of the distance between us and God we ought to tremble at the idea of approaching Him. But Christ dispels this thought. We are not afraid to draw near to that gentle, loving, tender Man, who so pitied all human sor-

rows and human infirmities. And we feel that in drawing near to Him we are drawing near to God, for He was God manifest in the flesh. Oh, my friends, if Jesus were a mere man, although the best of the sons of men, we would be still in utter darkness with regard to God. We should be thankful for every holy God-fearing life that has been lived amongst us. We should never cease to offer that prayer which our Church has taught us: "And we also bless Thy Holy name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom." But we wanted more than a holy life. We wanted our God to come down and dwell among us and dwell in us, that we might know Him and understand His will towards us, and feel something of His love. Christ has satisfied this want of humanity. But He has done more. He has shown that there is such an affinity between our human nature and God that it is possible for God to dwell in us, and work in us and through us. I am not afraid to take hold of His hand in the darkness to lead me when I know that His heart is beating lovingly and tenderly towards me. And this is the real foundation of our trust in God—to believe in His love. This was the characteristic feature of the life of our dear departed brother—His implicit faith and trust in God. He knew whom he believed. He knew Him not merely as his God and Father, but as his Saviour, his companion, his friend and brother. He knew that all power was given unto Christ both in heaven and earth, and that that power was graciously exercised in the interests of the sons of men, and that, therefore, all things must work together for good to them that love God. Because the life and destinies of every loving, trustful heart are under the control and guidance of God. He was also a man of prayer. He lived in constant communion with God. With him prayer was no mere form. It was a real thing. It was the child speaking to his Father. The time spent in God's presence each day was very precious to him. His prayer was—

"His soul's sincere desire unuttered or expressed—
The motion of a hidden fire that trembled in his breast."

And how earnestly he prayed for others! Not only in general, but individually and especially for the erring. And the hearts which the Spirit of God has not influenced for good in answer to his prayers must be utterly hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. He was also a very diligent student of the Word of God. Wherever he went he carried his New Testament with him. He could well answer in this respect to the Psalmist's description of a righteous man: "In his law doth he meditate day and night." We all know how regularly he attended public worship. He was never absent for any reason, except illness. If his place were vacant, there was real cause for alarm. And even when his malady increased, and he became so feeble and helpless that he could not get to church without the greatest possible effort, he was there all the same. I don't know anyone who would have come under the circumstances but himself. I have never seen him turn away from the Holy Communion. He embraced every opportunity of showing the Lord's death,—that death which was the life of the world. He did not think it sufficient to come once or twice a year, but as often as he saw that Table spread, so often did he draw near with faith and take that Holy Sacrament. He was also thoroughly practical and energetic with regard to the temporal concerns of the parish. Up to the very last he attended to the finances, and although the people are very few, he was determined that the Church should always be kept open in which the Word of God should be faithfully preached and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's Ordinance.

He was always desirous of doing good to every one with whom he came in contact. He was not ashamed to confess Christ before men. He knew the truth as it is in Jesus, and he earnestly longed that others should know it too. He was most earnest that every man should know Jesus as his Saviour, and be able to say from heartfelt experience, "He loved me, and gave Himself for me." And the good which he effected in this quiet way of dealing personally with people on the question of their salvation will only be known at that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, and every man's work tried of what sort it is. The impression which a holy life like his has made cannot easily be effaced. He will never be forgotten by those who knew him intimately. He will still live amongst us in the good which he has done. And surely this is the best way to be immortalized —to be remembered by those, be they ever so humble, to whom we have been useful in our day —to have our graves watered by some tears of genuine friendship—to be enshrined, though but in one heart, that we have cheered, or consoled, or instructed, or led to good. But we must remember that every Christian life that has been lived amongst us is for our imitation and example. "Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ," says St. Paul. The beauty of Christ may be still seen in the lives of His people—in their faith, their love, their unselfishness, and their sympathy. Let us imitate them here that we may be united to them above. Let us make it our earnest concern so to live that we may follow them whither they have gone, and be united with them in endless fellowship in the house of their Father and our Father, their God and our God. The more of our friends go before us the greater is the number of our friends in heaven. As the circle narrows on earth, it widens in the skies.

"They are happy now, and we,
Soon their happiness shall see."

Let us mingle with our sorrow thankfulness to God that they have been taken from the evil which is in the world. And if their society was so precious to us, and so sweet during the few perilous years of their pilgrimage here below, what will it be in the home above, where there shall be no fear of separation, where there shall be no sorrow nor crying, where there shall be no more pain and no more death, for the former things shall have passed away.

The way also in which the Apostle speaks of death is very instructive and comforting. To the Christian, death is to fall asleep in Jesus. This contains in it the promise of an awaking. It speaks of the resurrection morn when they that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. Yes, our dear ones, who were with us once, but whom we see not now, whose footsteps sound not upon our threshholds, but whose memory is in our deepest heart never thence to be effaced, are not lost to us for evermore, they are not dead, they only sleep to wake and live again.

Another thought is that the death of our dear brother, although not quite unexpected, was in the end very sudden. This is the way that death comes to most people; not soon, perhaps, but suddenly. It found him, however, prepared,—living in communion and fellowship with his God by faith in Jesus Christ. Are we also ready? We know not the hour. If it were to-night, would our death be a falling asleep in Jesus? The last time he was at the Lord's Table was Christmas Day, and strange to say the Communion which was his *last* on earth was the *first* of another at the same Table. Such are the ways of the Lord—one beginning the journey and another ending. "Let us not, therefore, be ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are asleep; that we sorrow not even as the rest which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."

THE NOBILITY OF MAN.

By the Rev. T. SELBY HENREY, Curate of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, in the City of London.

Four Lectures Preached in the Parish Church of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, on the Sunday Evenings of January 26th, February 2nd, 9th, 16th, 1890.

Lecture I.

"What is Man? . . . . . For thou hast made him but little lower than God."—Psalm viii. 4 (R.V.).

THE sidereal heavens are calculated to raise our admiration and to move us to solemn reflection and elevate contemplation, for they cause our human knowledge to range from system to system, from planet to planet, from orb to orb, until at last they centre in the dazzling golden sun, making us to think of the Divine Architect and the Great Sun of Righteousness. As Dean Perowne observes, while the nocturnal heavens lift up man's conception of God's glory, they are no less calculated to suggest man's littleness.

> "When Thy amazing works, O God!
> My mental eye surveys,
> Transported with the view, I'm lost
> In wonder, love, and praise."

If so with us, how much more natural for an Oriental gazing on his midnight heavens to ejaculate, "when I consider Thy heavens, the work of Thy fingers, the moon and the stars which Thou hast ordained!" In this 8th Psalm David is represented as being overcome in his soliloquy with the glory of the Divine Architect as seen in the liquid depths of the amazing grandeur of the vast canopy environing him—suddenly his musings turn from the inanimate to the animate, and the Poet-shepherd breaks forth with the enquiry which has since been echoed along the vistas of ages—"What is Man?"

This question of the sweet Psalmist of Israel is not confined to those

> "Holy fields
> Over whose acres walked those blessed feet
> Which, eighteen hundred years ago, were nailed,
> For our advantage, on the bitter cross,"

for every classical student will remember that the words, "KNOW THYSELF," formed the laconic motto deeply chiselled in golden characters upon the portico of the elaborate temple of Delphi, five centuries before the Christian era.

And in obedience to the enquiry, history repeats itself and asks the question, "What is Man?" in our enlightened nineteenth century; sometimes prompted by idle curiosity, sometimes by *bonâ fide* amazement.

Now the very complexity of man's inner being, and the relationship in which he stands to the eternal universe, renders a solution difficult; but as descendants of men who made our common fatherland famous through facing difficulties, let us not blink but humbly confront the interrogation. Our primary duty is to investigate if we have its solution in the human frame; to this end let us have recourse to the writings of a popular author, who says, "I stood last year in the central aisle of the Health Exhibition at South Kensington, and observed a graceful English girl lost in momentary interest over the show-case containing the precise ingredients of her fair and perfect frame. There—neatly measured out, labelled and deposited in trays or bottles—were exposed the water, the lime, the phosphorous, the silex, the iron, and other various elements perversely styled 'clay,' which go to the building up of our houses of flesh and bone . . . . . the joyous health, the exquisite capacities and the involved human life of the bright maiden who contemplated with unconvinced smiles those alleged materials of her being! . . . . . This

much of man can be clinically analysed; but where life begins our knowledge ceases, the soul of man was breathed immediately from God."

We will advance a step, and argue with Bishop Butler that our organised bodies will not aid us, for we may lose our limbs and organs of sense; and states Prof. Huxley: "So constant and universal are absorption, waste, and reproduction, that it may be said with perfect certainty that there is left in no one of our bodies at the present moment one-millionth part of the matter of which they were originally formed." We are throwing off particles from our bodies momentarily. In the words of St. Paul "the outward man is perishing," as regards our bodies "we die daily."

Man simply viewed from the realms of physics may be likened to the pyramids of Egypt from the realms of known history: "Oh, colossal statue, what object were you intended to serve?" we enquire—and the ages of time waft nothing save a revolting and perplexing silence.

In physical organisation man is an animal; he lives in an earthly tabernacle; the structure is that of the mammalia; in his inward man he resembles God. Bishop Harold Brown observes that "man apart from ennobling influences degenerates, and losing more and more of the image of his Maker, becomes more closely assimilated to the brute creation, the earthly nature overpowering the spiritual. But that this is not natural to him is shown by the fact that, under such conditions of degeneracy, the race becomes enfeebled, and at last dies out; whereas the domesticated animal, which reverts to the life of the wild animal, instead of fading away, becomes only the more powerful and the more prolific. The wild state is natural to the brutes, but the civilised is natural to man.

In some circles it seems to be fashionable to speak of man in tones of despondency, and we often find ourselves within earshot of sentiments which are but echoes of the language which was uttered in bygone days. Following in the wake of the eclectic philosopher Celsus, who, at the end of the second century after our Lord, asserted that man has no place beyond the more intelligent insects, since bees and ants organise themselves into communities and settlements, manifesting a loyalty to leaders and chiefs, waging war upon, and declaring armistice unto, each other. Though every age has had her Celsus, yet mankind in general has recoiled from any theory that is calculated to cause the nobler yearnings of his nature to explode like air bubbles on the water. Realise what a progressive and developing mind is that of man, as we compare it down the avenue of history in the early Briton worshipping at Stonehenge an avenging Deity, to his descendants worshipping a purer and nobler Being—the God of Love—within the consummated architectural walls of the Abbey of Westminster. But the bird builds its nest, sings the same song, and the bee constructs its hive now precisely as they did when our progenitors adored the mistletoe, and offered sacrifice to Woden and Thor.

Instinct leads the young to copy its parent, but this imitation cannot be classified with intelligence; a dog is not a successor, it is a repetition. The savage's dog is the same as the European's. Can the same be said of their respective masters? No, the former is stationary, while the latter is ever advancing. The world was not created for repetition, or else Christ would never have supplanted Adam, nor our English piety the darkened myths of heathendom.

Again, can the view of Celsus be supported from God's revealed Word? Let us see. On the opening page it is said of man, and man alone: "Let him have dominion over all"; repeated when Jehovah pronounced the blessing upon Noah and his sons: "And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth"; and mankind was again reminded by God speaking by the mouth of David in the 8th Psalm: "Thou madest him to have dominion . . . all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field. . ." That man before the Fall had the vicegerency over the animal world we gather from the beginning of Genesis, for Adam was commanded to name them to symbolise his power; and so long as he manifested loyalty to the great Giver of All, all creation was docile to him. But he who fails to command himself must of necessity lose the respect of others. The fortress having been attacked, a breach having been made in the human citadel, man became exposed to dangers on all sides, though in isolated cases this prerogative has been temporally restored to the saints of God, as Noah by faith wielded a sceptre over all, Elijah ministered unto by the raven, Elisha protected by the bear, Daniel the lions, St. Paul the venomous viper, and others who have "stopped the mouths of lions. . ." In a partial sense man is truly lord of creation, a truth that must be evoked during a visit to the Zoological Gardens. Yet in its fullest sense it is still to be fulfilled, though dependent much on man's faith.

Man has two elements which differentiate him from the brute creation which perishes; in man's nature there is inseparably bound up a memory for the past and an anticipation for the future. The dog yelps at pain, but the moment the suffering has subsided he can wag his tail as before. It is otherwise with man, though physically the wound may be healed, yet mentally the agony may be lived over again by memory. So with this anticipation man cannot live as the beasts of the field that go and continue their browsing when one by one is led away to the slaughter. An animal lives from moment to moment; it has reason only so far as its immediate profit is concerned. Man knows that certain signs indicate disease and death, and so his whole future may be harassed by anticipation. From this memory and anticipation there comes

the agony of retrospect and the agony of suspense of that which is imminent; and on the happier side of the question these two attributes enable man to grasp, as it were, in one flash the whole of his life, past and future. A memory to remind man that "days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom." An anticipation to fight a good fight, to keep the faith, to finish his course, "for henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness."

"A man," says an able writer, "is never called an animal in the Bible in the primary sense of the word, but either in a comparative sense, or with some addition; as when St. Paul speaks of the animal man, where he includes not the whole man, but only the inferior as opposed to the superior man. Where man is likened with the nobler animals for his nobler qualities their animality is kept out of sight."

Man seems to occupy a centre position in the universe, in physical organisation man is an animal; he lives in a material envelope, but he far surpasses the animal over whom he undoubtedly wields a superior force. In respect of his moral and rational nature he resembles God. Man is endowed with intellectual faculties, the animal has instinct. Man is given articulate speech, the animal is dumb. Man has memory for the past and an anticipation for the future, the animal makes no expression beyond the moment of pleasure or pain. Man's body, like a trustworthy ship, is controlled and kept in submission to God's laws by the helm of conscience. The animal has no sense of responsibility; the animal, like the rudderless bark, responds only to the convenience of the moment.

In man may be traced the embedded instincts of a God—offending that God by sin, embracing a life to come. In short, man can only be surpassed by the brute creation when he allows history to echo itself, and as of old utter the mournful wail: "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider."

But there is another privilege donated to man in the Psalm where the text is enshrined: "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet." Take, for instance, man's imitative art; is not this a resemblance of the Creator's power? Ponder how the whole world without man is reflected in man, and is reproduced in the various forms—architecture and the sciences, music and painting.

Man shows his vicegerency over things animate and inanimate by perceiving that the structures both of the animal and vegetable kingdom are constructed on architectural principles, being strengthened where weight has to be supported and pressure resisted, and becoming more slender where lightness is required. The trunk of a tree, and the manner in which it secures itself into the ground, so as to be able to defy the tempests of a hundred winters, is said to have given valuable hints to the celebrated engineer Smeaton in the construction of the Eddystone Lighthouse; while Sir Joseph Paxton confessed that his main ideas for the erection of the Crystal Palace were borrowed from the observations of the wonderful provision made for the supporting the broad leaf of the magnificent *Victoria regia* water-lily. Sailors have discovered many features now incorporated into naval architecture from marine animals—the nautilus, commonly called the Portuguese man-of-war, setting up a sail which consists of a crest surmounting the bladder; the mussel, anchoring itself by means of thread of a horny material; the fish's tail, acting as a scuttle, enabling it to plough its way through the ocean.

One train of thought gives birth to another. Man again shows his lordship over the works of God by subjugating his natural foes of fire and water in those mysterious foundries of science, enslaving their combined forces to propel his floating palaces, to whirl along the railway train, and to throw their superhuman force into the complex machinery of busy factories; in arresting the lightning as it rifts asunder in its play the blackened firmament, and causing it to become his facile and docile slave, to wing thoughts across continent and beneath ocean. Man's delegated power is attested by his tunnelling mountains, ransacking their treasures, honeycombing the earth, appropriating her bounty, exacting her secrets, and deciphering the age and origin of her strata, products, fossils; and even in a still greater degree when he unlocks nature's laboratory, analysing the invisible air, demonstrating it to be a simple compound of invisible gases, oxygen and nitrogen; in unsolving the mystery of water, and showing the limpid stream, as well as the restless main, to be composed of two invisible gases, oxygen and hydrogen, which the chemist can at his sweet will decompose and reunite. And is it necessary to mention how man has scaled the very empyrean, ablaze in all its brilliant pageantry, and been able to measure the planets that sweep afar, ascertaining their velocities, weighing the stars in the hollow of his hand. Man, a mere speck—the finite endeavouring to grasp the infinite—has revealed to fellow-man that the great sun itself is composed of iron, magnesium, sodium, chromium, nickel, and other compounds; the fixed stars, as seen by the telescope, to be about one hundred million in number; they are each a sun and a centre of another solar system, tracing solar system behind solar system until he loses himself in the immensities of space.

Methinks, to use borrowed language, "that in every region of this vast empire of God, hymns of praise and anthems of glory are rising and reverberating from sun to sun and from system to

system—heard by Omnipotence alone across immensity and through eternity!" and, may we add, the noblest vehicle is MAN.

"How poor, how rich, how abject, how august,
How complicate, how wonderful is man!
How passing wonder HE who made him such!
Who centred in our make such strange extremes!
From different natures marvellously mix'd,
Connexion exquisite of distant worlds!
Distinguish'd link in endless chain!
Midway from nothing to the Deity!
A beam ethereal, sullied and absorb'd.
Though sullied and dishonour'd, still divine!
Dim miniature of greatness absolute!
An heir of glory! a frail child of dust!
Helpless, immortal! insect *infinite!*
A worm! a God! I tremble at myself;
And in myself am lost."

THE Bishop of Ripon, says the *Manchester Guardian*, officially intimates that literates are not admitted in his diocese. Non-graduates must qualify for his ordinations by spending two years at a theological college, and by obtaining not less than a second-class certificate at the preliminary theological examination. The Bishop will hold his first ordination this year on March 2nd.

THE Bishop of Ely gives notice in the *Ely Diocesan Remembrancer* that it is his wish that no clergyman should be allowed to take temporary duty, for however short a period, unless he is personally known to the incumbent or curate in charge, and that the name of every clergyman who it is proposed should officiate for more than one Sunday may be submitted for his lordship's approval in the first instance. "Attention to this rule on the part of one incumbent has lately enabled me to prevent his engaging as curate a clergyman who is under suspension *ab officio* for a very grave offence (not drunkenness); while I have just been informed of a case in another diocese, where, from neglect of these precautions, a clergyman has actually been ministering for some time, though he has been guilty of such an action as proved him utterly unworthy to do so."

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1890.

CONTINENTAL RESTRICTIONS ON PEACE PROPAGANDISM.

WHILST the English friends of Peace may legitimately derive encouragement from their recent endeavours to extend their principles in France and Italy, it is needful for some of them to be reminded that on the European Continent generally, and especially in the vast empires of Germany, Austria, and Russia, almost insuperable obstacles to such propagandism are effectively imimposed by the authorities.

Some of our French friends have lately remarked to this effect:—"You have been distributing the Peace Society's literature, by scores and hundreds of thousands, in our country; you have met us in Congresses, in Paris, and you have urged us to promote, by every means in our power, the extension of International Arbitration and conciliatory diplomacy. All this is very good work, and we duly appreciate it. But are you doing as much amongst our neighbours, the Germans? Does not that intensely military Empire especially require to be also indoctrinated with pacific sentiments?"

Now, in the first place, an answer of a character more complimentary to France, than to Germany, may be made to such intimations as these. For, as a matter of fact, there is much more popular freedom of action enjoyed by the French people and their foreign visitors than by the inhabitants of the great nation over the Rhine. The spirit of the Republic is more favourable to free discussion, both by tongue and press, than is the case under the stern military bureaucracy directed by Bismarck from Berlin. In France, although the right of public meeting is decidedly more restricted than in

Great Britain, or America, or even Italy, yet it exists to a certain extent. Whereas in Germany, no public meeting, on any question whatever, may be held without the attendance and permission of the police; and the latter may at any moment break up such a meeting in the most arbitrary and despotic manner, and merely from their objection to any sentiment uttered which may happen to differ from their opinions. It is almost incredible to Englishmen and Americans, when they learn the extent to which such an intelligent and highly educated nation as the Germans are treated by their Government and its police myrmidons, as if they were so many dogs to be kicked and driven at will.

At Berlin the military bureau is so vigorously repressive of individual freedom, that even most of the University Professors and Members of the Legislature have become as timorous as children in regard to any action, or utterances, which might be deemed unacceptable to the Government. The least intelligent and most subordinate of police officials have power to promptly repress the the utterances, or meetings, of the foremost men in Germany, whenever, in their own view, the sentiments advocated are not in unison with the absolutism and militarism of Bismarck and the Emperor.

But besides this direct suppression, there are various indirect ways of imposing silence, or discouraging free speech. For in Germany, the Government is an immense employer of labour. It owns the railways, and is also largely concerned in manufactures. Hence multitudes of people are dependent upon it for their daily occupation and support The vast barracks scattered over the Empire afford the army authorities innumerable opportunities of extending patronage and profitable advantages to subservient local friends, and of withholding these privileges from any persons, whether rich or poor, whose independent opinions may render them in the slightest degree obnoxious to the powers that be.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

"THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH."

SIR,—The phrase, "the heavens and the earth" occurs in Haggai ii. 21, upon which Bishop Newcome, as quoted by Dr. A Clarke, says "We may well understand this and the twenty-second verse of the calamity undergone by Babylon in the reign of Darius, of the Macedonian Conquests in Persia, and of the wars which the successors of Alexander waged against each other." Bishop Newton in his "Dissertations on the Prophecies" tells us that "it is customary with the prophets, after they have described a thing in the most symbolical and figurative diction, to represent the same again in plainer language," and says that Haggai explains the "shaking of the heavens and the earth" by adding, "I will overthrow the *throne* of *kingdoms*, and I will destroy the strength of the *kingdoms of the heathen*." The phrase occurs again in Heb. xii. 26, and upon it the Rev. C. Simeon, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, in his *Horæ Homileticæ*, remarks, "Thus he (the apostle) shows us that not any convulsion of *nature* was intended, like that which took place at Mount Sinai, but the total removal of the whole *civil* and *ecclesiastical polity* of the Jews was predicted, in order to make way for the immovable and everlasting kingdom of the Messiah." Dr. A. Clarke says the same verse "refers to the total abolition of the political and ecclesiastical constitution of the Jews, the one being signified by the *earth*, and the other by *heaven*, for the Jewish State and worship are frequently thus termed in the prophetic writings." Lightfoot, as quoted by Dr. Clarke, says, on Matthew xxiv. 29-30, that "the *Jewish heaven* shall perish, and the sun and moon of its glory and happiness shall be darkened—brought to nothing. The sun is the religion of the Church, and the moon is the government of the State, and the stars are the judges and doctors of both." And Dr. Warburton, quoted by Bishop Newton, says this verse refers not to "the second coming of Christ, but to the abolition of the Jewish policy."

Lengerke says "the host of heaven" in Daniel viii. 10, means the "priests and worshippers of Jehovah, with which Maurer agrees. And Barnes, in confirmation of this adds, that such an interpretation accords with the language used elsewhere of the priests and *rulers* of the Hebrew people." This last named author remarks on "upon the earth," in Isaiah xxiv. 21, that it signifies those "*beneath* or *inferior* to those who had places of the highest trust and honour."

More might be added on this point, but enough has been given to show what a despicable figure "Presbyter" makes of himself, by charging these men, Newton, Newcome, Warburton, Simeon, Clarke, Lengerke, Lightfoot, and Barnes, with "incredibly debasing Scripture," because they put upon Scripture the interpretation that Scripture puts upon itself. We have seen above that Haggai, as Bishop Newton remarks, explains "the heavens and the earth" by the "*Kingdoms* of the heathen." A kingdom includes the governing and the governed classes. According to the general usage of Scripture, and that of St. Paul in particular; according to the plan of salvation, the rules of sound criticism and reason, it can have no other meaning in Ephes. i. 10, Col, i. 20. That it does not *always* mean the "whole creation" *cannot be contradicted*, *Only those saved by faith* in Christ *now* will be "recapitulated." Neither can this be contradicted. Dr. Clarke, whom I have quoted so often, says "I believe the forming of one Church out of both Jews and Gentiles is that to which the apostle refers." The same is his opinion on Col. i. 20. Burkitt says the words in Ephes. i. 10, "discover to us the end and design of God, in making known the mysteries of His will, that is in revealing the Gospel; it was to *gather into one universal Church Jews and Gentiles*, under Christ their Head." It will not do for Presbyter to *assume*, as he does in the last sentence of his letter, that the phrase in Ephes. i. 10, and Col. i. 20, means "the whole creation," and then, on *that assumption*, proceed to try and show that it cannot mean anything else. This is the old fallacy of the *petitio principii*

to which many people are so viciously addicted. It is easy to talk of "interpolations," and "impossible translations," but then it is *only* talk, *empty* talk, just so much "sounding *brass*," and *nothing more.*

"B" forgets that "all those whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire," and seems not to know that they are "punished with everlasting destruction *from the presence of the Lord*, and from the glory of His power," 2 Thes. i. 9.

I am sorry that he called the apostle's (Heb. vi. 2) doctrine of "eternal judgment" a "mania." He might have called my *zeal* for the doctrine a "mania," but to speak of the doctrine itself in that way is scarcely consistent with the reverence due to Scripture. But then he was "offended—yes, disgusted." Poor fellow! If he only knew how little I regard him or his anger, I fancy he would hardly have blown himself into such a storm. But *why* is he offended at me? Because I "positively assert" that I don't like to go hell. Things are come to a pretty pass. But wisdom is justified of her children; and so long as I can go straight to heaven by a simple faith in Christ, I will not—God being my helper—take the circuitous route through "age-long" torments in the abodes of darkness. So long as the blood of Christ can cleanse me from *all* sin I need no other, and I will adopt no other, remedy. *Why* should I go to hell? *Why* should any man go there? I have often asked this question, and have never yet got an answer. I ask it once again. Can you tell me, "B"? Amidst your awful profanity in speaking of "making damned work of salvation," can you tell me *why* a man should go to hell? You can't. Then write no more on this subject. Perhaps Presbyter will answer it? Perhaps, "sweeping the whole creation with *his* eagle glance," he may find an answer? But alas! he has not that "eagle glance," what then will he do? Let him take time during his screaming farce about "interpolations" to find me an answer somewhere. He can't. Does not this impotence on his part clearly prove that his universalism is only a burlesque of the Scripture economy of salvation? And is not his system a gross insult of despicable meanness to the mercy, goodness, love, power, and willingness of our adorable Redeemer. In the mercy of God a special provision has been made to save people from going to hell; why then should they go there? We ought to get this question answered before we go any further. "O my soul, come not thou into the secret of these men, unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united," for by their distortion of Scripture they would kill thee, and rob thy Redeemer of His glory.

R. DONALDSON.

February 6th, 1890.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

SIR,—You appear to have two correspondents, one signing himself "B." and the other "J. B.," and it is a coincidence that they take the same side on this question of Eternal Punishment. The first gentleman finds fault with me, and states that I charge him with saying things that will damn people. If he had read my letter with attention he would have seen that I referred not to anything he said, but to the doctrine of Purgatory, a place wherein persons' souls are purified after undergoing a certain period of punishment, as taught by the Roman Catholic Church, and by him if he maintains that the punishment of the sinner is not eternal. He says that only one of the passages in Matthew to which I referred him explicitly states the punishment is everlasting; but I would respectfully ask "B." do any of the other passages state it is not? I affirm they as distinctly imply that it is an everlasting punishment, as if they said so in so many words. "B." is angry with me for peering into the unseen. I do not peer into the unseen beyond this, that I take God's Word as my guide, and prefer it to any teaching that "B.," or those who sympathise with his views, may advance. But I would venture to say to "B.," that had I intruded into those things I had not seen, and it were an offence to do so, has not he been guilty of a like offence, and that without any authority to sustain him? Surely he would do well to take the beam out of his own eye before he attempts to extract the mote out of mine.

Your Correspondent, "J. B.," in the PULPIT of the 8th inst. takes me also to task about the Kingdom of Purgatory, and quotes a number of the fathers in support of an intermediate state. Knowing how grievously many of the fathers have erred in their interpretation of Scripture, I prefer, with all due respect to "J. B.," to accept the plain and simple teachings of God's Word. Let him show me any passage in the New Testament which favours purgatory, and I shall read it, and if I agree with him I shall say so. I stated in my letter that the dogma of purgatory was of the 13th century, not older, and in confirmation of this I would refer him to Draper's book on the "Conflict between Science and Religion," where he will find the subject discussed very fully.

I am inclined to think, sir, that all these letters and arguments about the eternity of punishment are time and ink wasted. They must end where they began—no new revelation is likely to be made respecting it—no one is likely to come from the dead to "pour on misty doubt effulgent day." We must come back to the question, "What saith the Scriptures?" and abide by the answer we find therein. Would it not be better, more useful and more practical, if these gentlemen would turn their talents in the direction of showing how the spiritual interests of our Church can be best advanced, and how far it would be desirable to admit the lay element into the active work of the Church's Mission. These are questions which many laymen, like myself, are seriously considering, and are anxious for counsel and advice. They are questions of grave moment in the present day when scepticism is increasing to so alarming an extent; and when men for want of active work are prone to become cold and indifferent. I do trust the clerical readers of the PULPIT will direct their attention to the subject, and endeavour to gather the lay element more closely around them as co-workers in our Master's vineyard.

J. A. WALKER.

Dublin.

SIR,—In the last number of the PULPIT (February 8th), a passage in the review of the Bishop of Manchester's Lectures somewhat perplexes me. The reviewer says: "The Bishop shows how among the thoughts about God, which already existed in a scattered condition, Jesus selected one to be the master-thought of 'religion, "the Fatherhood of God." He then asks, "whence could He have derived this thought?" and answers: "Not from the Gentiles . . . . still less from the Jewish influences then existing . . . . from no contemporary or pre-existing source whatever . . . . Having thus

vindicated the title of our Lord to the original authorship of His central doctrine" etc. I am not sure that I clearly apprehend the drift of the opening words, but as to the meaning of the concluding sentences there can be no doubt. I take them as a clear assertion that the notion of the Fatherhood of God was not entertained before the Christian era. This surely is not the case. Does not St. Paul, speaking of his kinsmen according to the flesh, the Israelites, declare that to them "pertaineth the *adoption* (*υἱοθεσία*)" as well as "the covenants" and "the giving of the law," and the "promises?" (Rom. ix. 3-4); and what does Isaiah mean by exclaiming, "Doubtless Thou art our Father though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: Thou, O Lord, art our Father" (Isaiah lxiii. 16). So in Exodus "Israel is my son, even my first-born" (Ex. iv. 22). So, too, Hosea speaks of the time when it shall be said to the Israelites, "Ye are the sons of the living God" (Hosea i. 10). We find moreover in the Psalms, "Thou art my Father, my God" (Ps lxxxix. 26, cf. Ps. xxvii. 10). Again in the Book of Wisdom, which Canon Churton, for "good reasons," ascribes to pre-Christian times, we read that "the righteous calleth himself, the child of the Lord . . . and maketh his boast that God is his Father" (Wisdom ii. 13-16). Surely, then, the Jews must have had a clear enough conception of the "Fatherhood of God." That it was also no strange idea to the Gentiles seems sufficiently evident from those words of Cleanthes, "we are also his offspring," which St. Paul quoted when addressing the Athenians (Acts xvii. 28). Indeed, is not the fact of this belief preserved as a fossil in the very name Jupiter? Father Jove, whom Virgil represents (as Homer represents Zeus, "Zeus being the same word as Ju in *Ju*piter in Latin" Max Müller) as being the Father not only of gods, but also of men. But although truth forbids us to ascribe to our Lord "the original authorship of his central doctrine," "the Fatherhood of God," as the Bishop of Manchester seems to do, nevertheless.

> "We yield all blessing to the Name
> Of Him Who made it current coin,
> . . . . . and wrought
> With human hands the Creed of Creeds,
> In loveliness of perfect deeds,
> More strong than all poetic thought."

H. HEBER EVANS.

February 8th, 1890.

THE NEW SPANISH PRAYER-BOOK.

SIR,—In the preface to this Book, under the heading "what has not been included—and why?" we read, "others may regret that in the Baptismal offices (although the sacramental relationship between the outward sign and the inward grace is very clearly set forth) there is not a more distinct declaration (such as that in the Anglican office), affirming the regeneration of those who are baptised."

I now turn to the Exhortation to the God-parents in this office referred to, reminding them of what the baptised infant, when arrived at the years of discretion, is to be taught as to the signification of the rite: the words are, "as being the sign and seal and sacrament of spiritual regeneration, of remission of sins, and of adoption into the family of God." This, every baptised infant is to be taught, for there is no exception made; no distinction between elect, and non-elect; all—when arrived at the years of discretion—are to be taught that their spiritual regeneration, pardon, and adoption were signed, sealed and sacramentally confirmed at their Baptism. Now if such be the case, why object at the time to the assertion "seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is by Baptism regenerate," and "we yield Thee most hearty thanks;" when the child is to be taught afterwards that these blessings were conferred? Surely then, if the child may look back with thankfulness to its baptism, as a time when it received such blessings, and is to be taught to believe that such was the case, why should we scruple to assert at the time what we are to teach the baptised God then did for it? If Holy Baptism be more than a sign, and this New Spanish Prayer-Book says it is besides a seal and sacrament, then it is a seal of blessings conferred at the time, which a mere sign can never effect, but which the word seal implies. With such a statement inserted in this exhortation to the sponsors, I fail to see why any scruple should prevent the insertion of a "distinct declaration affirming the regeneration of those who are baptised." I may add that there is no Catechism attached to this New Spanish Prayer-Book.

INQUIRENS.

THE UNIVERSALIST'S VIEW OF THE ATONEMENT.

SIR,—I shall not controvert Mr. Lawrence's claim to superior knowledge. I should prefer to congratulate him that the facts, in this respect, are so. I would submit, notwithstanding, that this does not help the argument. His point is that the Universalist has the word and the thing. Mine is that he may use the word, but he has not the thing. Let us see which is right. We shall best ascertain this by asking a series of questions. I will invite Mr. Lawrence to give categorical answers. The answer in each case must be straight, and there must be no beating about the bush.

(1.) The Doctrine of the Atonement implies the universal depravity of the human race. Does the Universalist admit this?

(2.) It implies that man has no help in himself. Does the Universalist believe this?

(3.) It implies that salvation is all of sovereign grace. Does the Universalist believe this?

(4.) It maintains that faith, which is the means by which the benefits of the Atonement are applied, is the gift of God. Does the Universalist believe this?

(5.) It holds that faith depends for its exercise on the will of man being submitted to the sovereign will of God. Does the Universalist believe this?

(6.) The exercise of faith in the Atonement is accompanied with a holy life, showing itself in works of charity to men and devotion to God, and in which there is a foretaste of the joys of heaven. Does the Universalist believe this?

(7.) The Atonement saves from hell and saves for Heaven. Does the Universalist hold this?

Now it is plain that if a man hold the foregoing he is no Universalist. He is an orthodox Christian. How can a man hold that the Atonement saves from hell and at the same time say that there is none from which to be saved? Does not Mr. Lawrence see, what is perfectly plain, that it is impossible for any Universalist to hold the doctrine of the Atonement?

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, Feb. 15th, 1890.

P.S. I will reply to your other correspondents,

Mr. Editor, when they answer my last. Especially should I like to see how they will extricate themselves from the dilemma into which their absurd notions bring them, viz., "That the Great Creator governs the world on two distinctly opposite principles."

ST. THOMAS'S APPEAL TO A HIGHER COURT.

SIR,—The retiring season brings St. Thomas's case before us. Of his appeal there is no doubt. The Apostles, the living Church, reported the Resurrection. His appeal was, "Unless I see and handle, I will not believe." His appeal was allowed, "Reach hither thy hands, etc." The appeal confirmed the sentence of the lower court. In other cases the appeal produced a contradiction. When the Apostles thought they saw a Spirit, our Lord made them appeal to their senses, "Handle Me and see that a Spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have." The Collect says that St. Thomas was allowed to doubt "for the greater confirmation of our faith." The higher court confirmed the lower. No doubt our Lord in a way blamed St. Thomas for doubting, and blesses those who are satisfied with the report of the Church, without requiring the confirmation of sight, etc. But Rome will have it that the voice of the supposed Catholic Church is to be heard, and that there is no appeal. Our senses deny transubstantiation, as far as it is possible for them to allow or deny the presence of any substance. Rome says they cannot judge in such a matter. Then we have no proof of the reality of the Resurrection, as all rests on the supposition that the Apostles' senses could know one substance from another.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—I shall be glad to make a few observations on the above subject, partly because I have now devoted some years to the study of it, and partly because I do not think your correspondent has a sufficient command of materials to refute entirely Dr. Hobart. I speak under correction in assuming that Mr. Heber Evans relies solely or chiefly on the LXX. in both his letters, as unfortunately I mislaid my copy of the PULPIT of February 8th before opening it, a grievous loss, which I am hastening to repair.

Now, with this assumption, I can readily believe that Dr. Hobart as a conscientious and learned man would candidly acknowledge St. Luke's acquaintance with the LXX., and even the moulding of his phraseology in some measure upon it, and yet, I imagine, he would deny, as a *non sequitur*, that he was a "Greek-speaking Jew." It is surely not beyond the range of a Hellenistic Greek, who naturally made a close study of the LXX. before writing the third Gospel and Acts, to appropriate to his own use the graphic ἰδού, circumlocutions with γένεσθαι, and plastic expressions with πρόσωπον, χείρ, καρδία, στόμα, etc. His predilection for purer Greek, shown in a variety of ways in his writings, stamp him as of a different nationality from St. Matthew, for instance, who apparently writes Hebraicised Greek, unconscious of its offensive harshness to Greek ears. St. Luke, who is conscious of it, not only worked over the material of the sources of his works, and so produced, to a certain degree, a uniform linguistic character running through both his books, so that the same hand is discernible throughout, but, to the early chapters of his Gospel, where the Hebrew form of thought is most apparent, he prefixes a dedication to Theophilus written in pure Greek. This, I submit, fairly stamps his nationality as a Greek. The LXX. and Hebraising phraseology found in his writings appear to indicate nothing more than the influence of his studies in Jewish Scriptures and of the material he moulded into his works.

Passing on to the alleged "medical language" of St. Luke, I am not surprised to find that, by the the process of elimination adopted, Mr. Heber Evans has reduced Dr. Hobart's fair sized octavo volume before me, in argument at least, to one, "one miserable solitary word," and that a trivial and non-medical one, ἀνωτέρικος. But it is open to Dr. Hobart to suggest that mere vocabulary enumeration does not refute his position. There is the meaning to be considered as well as the word itself; *e.g.*, Luke viii. 44 we find ἱστάναι, in the sense of "to stanch," Acts xiv. 8, ἀδύνατος in the sense "of impotent." From page 55 to 85 Dr. Hobart compares in parallel passages the words employed by St. Luke, and found in medical writings with those of Matthew and Mark and presumably not so found. Is it a fact that, *e.g.*, τελεσφορέω is medical, but ἄκαρπος not, or προβάλλω medical, but ἐκφύω not? or again is it true that medical writers do not use such words as μαλακία, sickness, βασανίζω and βάσανος, of physical pain, παραλυτικός, paralysed, σεληνιάζω, to be a lunatic, all occurring in Matthew and not in Luke? I offer these as samples of Dr. Hobart's argument, and no mere counting up words, like votes at an election, will answer it. Manifestly Dr. Hobart cannot be answered out of the LXX. or contemporary Greek writers only; he must be met, if at all conclusively, on his own ground. The medical writers must be appealed to, however laborious the task. We want to know the sources of medical language and its position in respect to the educated classes in the first and second centuries of our era. Is it true that Greek medical language was conservative in its vocabulary from Hippocrates to Galen, as Dr. Hobart alleges? Is it not true that all the Greek medical terms, with which we are concerned, occur in Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and generally the Greek philosophical schools? Is it true that there are several books addressed by the medical writers to the general public, in which most of the said terms occur. Is it true that the works of Hippocrates were in the hands of all educated men? Is it true that Philo Judæus, Josephus, and particularly Plutarch in his "Moralia," contain passages which show a far greater acquaintance with medical language than St. Luke? When these questions are all cleared up, then will your correspondent and your readers be able to come to a reasonable conclusion, based, as it should be, on a thorough examination of the whole subject.

F. T. P.

February 17th, 1890.

SHOULD REBELS BE IN THE FORT OR OUT OF IT?

SIR,—Before a siege begins this question is often discussed. In general it is decided that the false-

hearted should depart. They only eat the food of the loyal and do the work of the enemy. Allow me to discuss this question now, theologically and politically. (1.) We have foes within the Church of two kinds, enemies alike to the forms they sign. I say let all who object to the 4th Article, on the Roman tack, and to the Church Catechism, on the Dissenter or Geneva tack, depart. As long as they remain they corrupt the faith of the old and the young alike. They can do less harm as open foes from without, than as traitors and corruptors within. (2.) I now turn to the political side of the question. How do we stand? It is said to be Cardinal Manning's boast that he has the whole press of England, metropolitan as well as provincial, under his thumb, the papers being manned by Jesuits, Irish born, and English perverts. We Irish are smart, not only with our tongues, but with our pens. We have some provincialisms; but they can be soon corrected. We have in a measure the fire of Burke and O'Connell and Swift. When you polish us up a little, we can work as well, or better than most, and we work cheaper than, Englishmen; at least we do so at first, and till we can command the highest wage. It is said, however truly I say not, that the strike in London was got up by Jesuits, that Cardinal Manning might have the credit of compromising it. If false, this is still quite credible. The disaffected Irish have so much weight in England that they can do much to turn elections in favour of Irish Independence. Now, I ask, would it not be really better for England if all these rebels at heart were shipped off to Ireland? Nay, would it not be better for England to cut us adrift entirely, and let us make ducks and drakes of our own wretched country, even tearing one another to pieces like the Kilkenny Cats. I am only speaking of England's interest in the matter. Of course we in Ireland would have to fight for our lives, as in Elizabeth's and Cromwell's times. But for England's own interest it is a question whether, with Ireland as a free and hostile nation, she would not be safer than she is with our Irish rebels working within her own bosom, corrupting the whole body politic from the highest to the lowest. It would indeed be a question of enormous proportions. But things should not remain as they are. England's press is in the hands of the disaffected. England's mind is within their grasp. This is so bad that it is a question whether things would be worse if an Irish, French or American flag, floated on the walls of Dublin Castle. Of course it would be our death struggle. But how would it be for England.

C. C., V.-G.

THE *Manchester Guardian* says that two Yorkshire Nonconformist Ministers are reported to have recently joined the Established Church, viz., the Rev. David Scott, late Unitarian Minister at Dewsbury, and the Rev. W. T. Gifford, for nearly five years minister of the Congregational Church, Ravensthorpe.

THE Bishop of Bedford, with some of his co-workers in the north and east of London, has been recently addressing a gathering of undergraduates (male and female) in the hall of King's College, Cambridge, under the chairmanship of the Master of Selwyn College. In the course of his speech the Bishop repeated a request which Bishop Walsham How made nearly two years ago in the same place upon the occasion of his last public appearance outside East London as Bishop of Bedford, viz., for a Cambridge House at the East-End. The mother parish of Stepney, of which the rector, the Rev. E. Hoskyns, is an old Cambridge "blue," was stated by the Bishop of Bedford to be in serious need of such support as a "Cambridge House" would be.

THE inaugural lecture of the Laudian Professor of Arabic, Oxford, noticed last term at the time it was delivered, has since been published in a pamphlet form by the University Press. It has this week been reviewed by two of his colleagues. Professor Driver has contributed two carefully wriiten articles upon it to the *Oxford Magazine*; Professor Cheyne has a notice of it in the *Athenæum*. Neither critic speaks of the work with entire favour. The special theory on which both seem to fasten is Professor Margoliouth's contention that the original work was a metrical composition, and that this metrical key (which he believes himself to have discovered) furnishes a valuable clue to the reconstruction of the text. Professor Driver goes the length of throwing doubt on the existence of any metre in Hebrew poetry at all, while Professor Cheyne, though stopping short of this, agrees with him in considering that the exigencies of the supposed metre have led the Professor of Arabic into the adoption in his attempted restoration of unusual and even ungrammatical Hebrew forms. The interest, however, of the problem depends not mainly on the question whether Professor Margoliouth is right in supposing that Eccliasticus was written in metre, but whether the language which the versions point to is such that it is separated by a wide interval from any of the canonical books of the Old Testament, so that we have in it and the character of its language a starting-point by which to determine the date of these books. That restorations of the text which are exceedingly probable point in many instances to late Hebrew forms and words seems to be admitted by the two critics; but till the question has been more adequately threshed out it would be rash to assume any certain results as established.

IN answer to an application, sanctioned and approved by the Bishop of Ripon, and presented through the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, an Order in Council has been issued assigning a separate district to St. Peter's, Allerton, Bradford. The Rev. George Buttanshaw, having been licensed minister of St. Peter's for the past seven years, is the first incumbent of the new parish. All future appointments are vested in the hands of the Bishop.

THE Dean of York, at the close of morning service in York Minster on Wednesday, proceeded to the Chapter House, and formally prorogued Convocation of the Northern Province until Tuesday, April 15th.

THE Bishop of London has fixed Tuesday and Wednesday, April 22nd and 23rd, for the session of the London Diocesan Conference.

A MEETING for the purpose of awakening new interest in the work of the Bishop of London's Fund was held at Canonbury House, Islington, on the 11th inst., under the presidency of the Rural Dean, the Rev. W. H. Barlow, vicar of Islington. The Rev. Henry Kirk, Secretary of the Fund, stated that the total contribution of Islington from all sources to the fund last year amounted to £291 10s. 5d. On the other hand, the fund had given to Islington no less than

£4,471 2s. within the year. Such a fund, supplying as it did on an average at least £20,000 per annum for the good of the Church throughout the whole diocese, ought not to be allowed to languish for lack of funds. The clergy present all undertook to allow sermons and offertories in aid of the fund in their churches on Rogation Sunday (May 11).

THE Bishop of Liverpool, speaking at the annual meeting of the Diocesan Church Aid Society, said that the Church of England was called a wealthy Church, and the country was said to be burdened with wealth, but there were incumbents with less than £200 a year responsible in the eye of the law for 6,000 or 7,000 people, whilst Nonconformist Clergymen, unassisted by endowments, were receiving £700 and £800 a year. He did not approve of the plan of sinking capital for the purposes of endowment, and receiving only 2½ or 2¾ per cent. It would be preferable to raise by annual subscription a sustentation fund, out of which a well-appointed committee could help the poorer clergy.

THE degree of D.D. has been offered by the University of Dublin to Archdeacon Gore, and will be conferred before the end of this month. The necessary robes have, we believe, been presented to the Archdeacon by some of the lady parishioners of Bowdon.—*Chester Diocesan Gazette.*

THE Ven. William Boyd, M.A., Archdeacon of Craven, has felt compelled, owing to advancing years, to resign the duties of the archdeaconry. Archdeacon Boyd, says the *Yorkshire Post*, has advanced several years beyond the threescore years and ten, and although still hale and active, his waning physical powers have made him desirous for some time past of relinquishing the duties of a heavy archdeaconry, rendered still more so by the fact that his home is twelve miles from the nearest railway station. Archdeacon Boyd graduated at University College, Oxford, in 1831, and was ordained in 1834. In 1835 he was presented to the Vicarage of Arncliffe-in-Craven, and has thus spent fifty-five years in that country parish, where "he is known to every one within its boundaries, and he is universally beloved and esteemed." He was made an Honorary Canon of Ripon in 1860, and in 1880 became Archdeacon of Craven. He was Rural Dean for North Craven from 1847 to 1880.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Barnes, Rev. William Henry, of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; Rector of the Cathedral and Parish Church of St. Andrew's, and Vice-Dean of the Cathedral, Honolulu.
Bennett, Rev. E. H., Senior Curate of St. John's, Penge; Vicar of St. James's, Doncaster.
Berry, Rev. G. B., Vicar of Emanuel, Compton Gifford; Surrogate for the Diocese of Exeter.
Black, Rev. R. C., M.A., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Bond, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Norton Mandeville, Essex.
Buttanshaw, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Allerton, Bradford.
Cornish, Rev. H. W., B.A., Rector of Blatherwycke, Northamptonshire.
Cotter, Rev. James Laurence, B.A., M.D., Perpetual Curate of St. Chad's, Handforth, Cheshire.
Daniel, Rev. William Eustace, M.A., Vicar of East Pennard, Somersetshire.
Ellis, Rev. Henry Venn, Vicar of Stowmarket, Suffolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.
Evans, Rev. William Franklin, M.A., Head Master of Cowbridge Grammar School; Perpetual Curate of Talygarn, Glamorganshire.
Fawssett, Rev. J. B., M.A., late Rector of Laughton, near Rugby; Vicar of Mears Ashby, Northampton.
Forbes, Rev. John de B., Assistant-Chaplain at St. Petersburg.
Freer, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Rector of Sudbury, Derbyshire; Honorary Canon of Southwell.
Frossard, Rev. C. E., Rector of Hammerwich, Lichfield.
Hamer, Rev. Thomas Edwin, M.A., Rector of Darlaston.
Hasluck, Rev. Ernest Edward, M.A., Licensed as Minister of the Church of St. Chrysostom, Birmingham.
Hobart-Hampden, Rev. Alfred Bertie, M.A., to officiate in St. Augustine's Mission Church, in the Parish of St. John-the-Baptist, Leytonstone.
Hodson, Rev. John, LL.D., Rector of St. Paul's, Deptford.
Johnson, Rev. A. F., M.A., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's Great Harwood; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Lewis, Rev. David, M.A., Vicar of Briton Ferry; Rural Dean of Groneath, Upper Glamorganshire.
Miller, Rev. Norman J., M.A., Vicar of Garton-in-Holderness; Rector of Winestead, in Holderness, Hull.
Molineaux, Rev. Charles Hurlock, Rector of Staveley, Chesterfield; Rural Dean of Staveley.
Mullins, Rev. T. P., LL.D., Chaplain to the Forces in London.
Murray, Rev. Canon F. W., M.A., Rector of Stone, near Dartford; Rural Dean of Gravesend.
Onslow, Rev. M. R. S., M.A., Chaplain to the *Colossus*.
Owen, Rev. David, Vicar of Alltmawr, Breconshire; Vicar of Vicar of Llangynog, Breconshire, by dispensation.
Peat, Rev. Thomas Heaviside, M.A., Rector of Mellis, Suffolk.
Rosser, Rev. C. A., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces in London; Chaplain to the Forces at Malta.
Sandford, Rev. George William, M.A., Rector of Rowberrow, Somersetshire.
Smith, Rev. C. S., Curate of St. Margaeret's, Roath, Glamorgan; Assistant Priest at Christ Church, Sydney, New South Wales.
Smith, Rev. George, Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class.
Smyth, Rev. J. B., Chaplain to the *Invincible*.
Steward, Rev. C. E., M.A., Vicar of Wrecclesham, near Farnham; Vicar of New Shoreham, near Brighton.
Sumner, Rev. Frederick, M.A., Rector of Compton Greenfield, Bristol.
Tancock, Rev. O. W., M.A., Head Master of Norwich Grammar School; Rector of Little Waltham, Chelmsford, Essex.
Tatham, Rev. Francis H., M.A., Head Master of the Cathedral School, Hereford; Vicar of Wing, Leighton Buzzard.
Tebbs, Rev. R., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Wigan.
Walter, Rev. J. Conway, Vicar of the District Church of Langton St. Andrew, Lincoln; Rector of the Parent Church of Langton-by-Horncastle, and Vicar of Woodhall.
Warrington, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of St. Matthew's, Luton; Rector of Offord Darcy, Huntingdon.
Weeks, Rev. Frederick Henry Brian, M.A., Licensed as Minister of the Church of St. Stephen, Selly Hill, Birmingham.
Whitefoord, Rev. Philip, M.A., Rector of Burford Second Portion, Shropshire.
Wilkinson, Rev. Michael Marlow Umfreville, M.A., Rector of Reepham-with-Kerdiston, Norfolk; Rural Dean of Sparham.
Wood, Rev. Dr. Joseph, Head Master of Leamington College; Head Master of Tonbridge School.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Candy, Rev. Charles, M.A., thirty-four years Rector of Shottermill, Haslemere, at Bronte Villa, South-hill, Guildford, on the 13th inst., aged 90.
Howard, Rev. Robert, M.A., Oxon, late Vicar of Rawdon, Yorkshire, and District Organising Secretary of the Church Defence Institution, on the 9th inst., aged 56.
James, Rev. Edward George, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean of Leyland, at Chorley Rectory (Lancashire), on the 17th inst., aged 46.
Jukes, Rev. William Malone, formerly Vicar of Ennerdale, at Bale, Switzerland, on the 9th inst., aged 69.
Wodsworth, Rev. John George, Vicar of Warlingham-cum-Chelsham, at 28, Elphinstone-road, Southsea, on the 9th inst. aged 73.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.—I.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington, Hants.

A Course of Sermons preached in Lymington Church during Lent.

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil."—Matt. iv 1.

I WISH to call your attention to the consideration of the subject that is introduced to us by the words of our text—the temptation of our Lord Jesus Christ by Satan in the wilderness. It is a subject of deep, solemn and mysterious interest, for in this single verse Jesus, the Son of God and the Son of Man—the Holy Spirit—and the Devil are brought before us. We are conducted into the wilderness there to witness the fierce temptations by which the Saviour of mankind was assailed by the Devil, who is called "the tempter," the most mysterious event in the history of the life of Christ, upon the issue of which hung suspended the destinies of mankind. Draw near, my brethren, to the consideration of this subject in a solemn and prayerful frame of mind; "cast off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground."

The temptation of Christ is recorded by three of the Evangelists, and it forms a suitable subject for the season of Lent, in which the Christian is specially invited to accompany the blessed Saviour throughout the forty days in which he was tempted of the Devil. I purpose, therefore, to invite your attention to the consideration of this subject on each Sunday morning in Lent, and may the Spirit of God direct and bless our meditations to our soul's profit.

Let us consider, first, the temptation itself, and then some considerations connected therewith. 1. In considering the temptation, remember that the person tempted was none other than the Eternal Son of God, who became the sorrowing son of man and tabernacled among us as man. The tempter was Satan himself, not one of his angels, but Satan himself, that old serpent who is called the Devil and Satan who tempted our first parents in the garden, and now assaulted the Saviour of mankind in the wilderness. Now, there are some who, considering that the divine nature was connected with the human nature in the person of Christ, think that the temptation was not real, that, in fact (like God himself) he could not be tempted of evil, and, therefore, that the temptations were not of the same nature as those with which his people are assailed; in fact, that the temptations were not real, but only in appearance. But is this a just or scriptural view of the subject? I answer, assuredly not. The Scriptures always speak of the temptations of Christ as real and intense. Indeed, were it otherwise, we cannot see what end it would answer in the work of man's salvation. We are told "He suffered being tempted," and that under such suffering, "with strong crying and tears, He made known His request unto God, and was heard in that He feared" (Heb. v. 7), and that "being made perfect through suffering He became the author of eternal salvation unto all that obey Him." There are others again who do not hesitate to affirm that if the temptations of Christ were real, then there must have been in Him who was tempted somewhat of the nature of sin. But is this, I ask again, a just or scriptural view of the subject? I answer, assuredly not. The Scriptures represent Him as "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners," that "in Him was no sin." "Which of you convinceth Me of sin" was the challenge of the Saviour Himself addressed to His enemies. And again He affirms, "Satan cometh and hath nothing in Me;" and the Apostle declares that "the Captain of our salvation was made perfect through suffering." Indeed, were it otherwise, He could not be a fit substitute for the sins of others, for then He would need "to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the people's." In considering the reality of the temptations of the blessed Saviour, it is well to bear in mind the *nature of the person* of Christ—that while he was the ever-blessed Son of God, and was in His divine nature "equal with God," yet that He was in His human nature perfect man, made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, "forasmuch," saith the Apostle, "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same." And again, "it behoved Him in all things to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God." Thus, it is clear that in His human nature Christ was made like unto us in all things, sin only except; but sin is not part of the nature of man, it is so mixed up with man's nature in his present fallen state that we are accustomed to consider it as a necessary part of humanity, but it is not so; though in point of fact "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God;" but it was not so with Christ; it was not so with Adam before his fall; it shall not be so with man in his glorified state. But while Christ was without sin, He partook of all the *infirmities* of human nature, which are not sinful in themselves. Thus he could be hungry, faint, and weary with his journey; He could feel compassion, sorrow, and anger; He fell asleep in the boat, he wept at the grave of Lazarus, and

He could, and did exclaim, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." Now, with all the infirmities that are inherent to humanity, you can understand how that the blessed Saviour might be placed in such circumstances where the wants of humanity demanded to be satisfied, and yet to do so would be sinful; and such were the circumstances under which He was "led up of the Spirit to be tempted of the Devil," for in those days, as St. Luke tells us, He did eat nothing, and afterward hungered. It was under such circumstances that the Devil came to Him, tempting Him unlawfully to satisfy the cravings for food. Oh yes, brethren, the temptations of Jesus were real and intense; that the holy Jesus should be compelled for forty days to be in close company with the Devil, to listen to his words, to hear the foul insinuations with which he tried to shake His faith and draw Him into sinful compliance with his wishes, to feel that He was alone, tempted by that Infernal Spirit, who is the enemy of God and man; this was enough to awake within His soul feelings of intense agony and suffering—yes, He suffered being tempted. The more holy His nature the stronger the recoil from contact with the wicked one, just as a brave and loyal soldier would resist with indignation the attempt to lead him to be false to his king and his country, just as a faithful and loving son would turn away with disgust from the base insinuation that would lead him to betray his father that nourished, or his mother that bore him. Just as the wife of pure and unsullied character would shrink back with instinctive horror from the presence of that man who, by word or deed, would throw an imputation on the purity of her virtue, even so did the holy soul of the blessed Jesus shrink with horror from the foul temptations of the wicked one, who tried to shake the strength of his faith and obedience to the will of His Heavenly Father.

2. But now let us turn to some *practical considerations* connected with the temptation of Christ, which may tend to strengthen your souls in the hour of temptation. And first, my Christian brother, I observe that the Lord Jesus Christ was tempted of the Devil, so may you. He was tempted, and yet "without sin," so may you. There are some real and sincere Christians who are greatly distressed, and led at times to doubt as to whether they be Christians at all because they are tempted of Satan. To such I would say "think it not strange concerning the fiery trial wherewith you are tried." There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to Christians of every age. The Lord Jesus was "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Temptation is not sin. It is yielding to the temptation that is sin. The sin of Eve did not consist in the fact that she was tempted of Satan, but in the fact that she parleyed with, and then yielded to the temptations of the evil one. Think of this, my Christian brother. When temptations assail you remember that Jesus was tempted, yet without sin. The disciple is in this respect "not above his Master." In the hour of trial "consider Him that endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself, lest ye be weary and faint in your mind." So shall you rise from your knees refreshed and strengthened as you come up from the wilderness leaning on your Beloved.

Observe, again, Jesus was *led by the Spirit* to be tempted of the Devil. St. Luke says Jesus "being full of the Holy Ghost was led by the Spirit into the wilderness." He did not go unbidden into scenes of temptation, but when led by the Spirit He cheerfully acquiesced with the will of God; and here is an example for us. We should not rush unbidden into scenes of temptation, nay, rather we should "watch and pray that we enter not into temptation." "Lead us not into temptation" is one of the petitions in our Lord's own prayer; but when led by the Spirit we may, we ought to, go where God directs, trusting to His protecting care; but you may ask how shall I know that I am led by the Spirit? I answer, the providence of God will generally make the path of duty clear to him that seeks for direction. While you should not rush from feelings of curiosity or excitement into scenes of natural or moral infection, yet if duty leads—as in the case of the minister of Christ, the physician, the city missionary, and others whose duty calls them into such scenes—to "rescue the perishing, to care for the dying," there you may, you ought to go, at the call of duty, fearing no evil. The path of duty is the path of safety.

Observe, again, the *time and circumstances* under which Jesus was led to be tempted of the Devil. The Evangelist tells us, "Then" was Jesus led to be tempted. "Then," when, we ask? We have an answer to this question by looking at the concluding part of the previous chapter, where we find that "Jesus, when He was baptised, went up straightway out of the water, and lo! the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Him. And lo! a voice from heaven saying, This is my Beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." It was immediately after this glorious manifestation of the divine approval declaring that He was the beloved Son of God in whom the Father was well pleased that Jesus was led to be tempted of the Devil. So in the case of St. Paul, it was immediately after he was taken up into Paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter, that "there was given him a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet him." So, my Christian brother, it may be at a moment the least expected by you—a time in which you have received comfort and refreshment in prayer or at the table of your Lord, when your soul is carried up into the third heavens and the ear of faith seems to listen to the unspeakable words of

Paradise, it is then perhaps that Satan may try by an unexpected assault to surprise you into sin. Therefore, we pray in the Litany "in all time of our wealth, natural or spiritual, good Lord deliver us." You are never sure of the time or circumstances under which Satan may tempt you; therefore at all times watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation.

But observe once more the *scene* of the temptation. He was led, we are told, into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil. He had been baptised in the river Jordan, and now, as St. Mark tells us, "the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness" (into the more northern and deserted regions of the wilderness), where "He was with the wild beasts." All nature around Him was dreary and deserted. He was alone with the tempter, and the very dreariness of the wilderness would contribute to have a depressing influence on the mind of the blessed Jesus which would give advantage to the temptations of Satan; but it was meet that Satan should be met and conquered on his own ground. Our first parents were overcome in the garden of Eden, and now the victory must be wrested from him in single combat with the Redeemer of mankind, in the dreary wilderness that thus the victory might be all his own, "for of the people there was none with him." And so the Christian is, in all places as well as at all times, exposed to the assaults of the wicked one. In the crowded city or the lonely desert he is alike exposed to his temptations. No time or place can shut out the tempter. Noah fell into sin in his tent. Lot in a cave. It is not place, but grace that can support you. You cannot flee from the Devil, but you have the assurance of that gracious promise that if "you resist the Devil" strong in the faith which Christ supplies "he will flee from you."

Meditate, my brethren, in a prayerful spirit over the scenes of Christ's temptations, follow Him in thought into the wilderness, dwell upon the subject. It is mysterious but profitable. It will open up to your mind deep thoughts on the human nature of Christ, His perfect Manhood, His wondrous love, His true sympathy, His awful sufferings undertaken for us men and for our salvation, that He might destroy the works of the Devil and "deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."

Come, my brethren, with all your sorrows, trials, and crosses to Jesus. He is able, He is willing, to succour you when tempted. He will not suffer you to be tempted above that you are able to bear, but will with the temptation make a way to escape that you may be able to bear it." You will find Him "a very presenthelp in time of need." Be encouraged to come. Your great High Priest was in all points tempted like as we are yet without sin, "let us, therefore, come boldly to the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need," till life's journey over, life's battle ended, you can sing with David, "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me, Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me."

THE NOBILITY OF MAN.

By the Rev. T. SELBY HENREY, Curate of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, in the City of London.

Four Lectures Preached in the Parish Church of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, on the Sunday Evenings of January 26th, February 2nd, 9th, 16th, 1890.

Lecture II.

"What is Man? . . . . . For thou hast made him but little lower than God."—Psalm viii. 4 (R.V.).

SO far the fringe only of the subject has been lightly touched; the question uppermost in the Psalmist's mind is still unanswered. That man is superior to the brute creation, and a few of his mighty attributes have been cursorily glanced at, but deeper waters have to be reached and fathomed to enable a reply to be given to the interrogation, "What is (the essence of) man?"

It was the daily question of one of the most eminent of saints: "*Benarde, ad quid venisti?*" "Bernard, for what purpose art thou here?" And this was but a faint echo of the interrogation put by God to Elijah, "What doest thou here?" To-day the eternal voice comes not to the great reformer of Israel in the wilderness, but to us who hourly pursue our respective avocations in the very centre of this mother city of our Fatherland.

At the onset it may be laid down as an axiom that man, like everything else, is a subject created for an object, and without knowing the object it is impossible to understand the subject; without detecting man's aim we shall possess no key to man's existence. What would we have known of the magnanimous heart of Dante had it not been for its object—the reverential love for Beatrice? To be in darkness of the relations established between any subject and its aim and object is to live in ignorance both of the first and of the ultimate cause of its existence.

In a tone of despondency man gravely approaches his fellow-men and asks, "Is life worth living?" This and all kindred questions can only be answered by the man who has discovered the end and aim of life. Of course there are many intermediate aims, but the dominant one which should permeate the whole being is: "I am not my own, I am bought with a price." As God is not only my Creator, but my Father and Educator, I must exercise obedience, and learn to unravel the tangled

skein of mysterious existence at His Paternal footstool. My Heavenly Father will then be to me what the sun's light is to this planet; if I turn my back on Him, my only fountain of spiritual light, I shall ever be haunted by those vain imaginings that will flit like gaunt spectres shadowing my chequered path. From the latter experience all human flesh recoils, and the instinctive cry of my heart will be: "O send out Thy light and Thy truth that they may lead me!"

There is an old legend to the effect that on the evening of the fifth day of Creation, after the Divine Creator had studded the heavens with those glittering pendants—the great and wide sea with the life contained therein, the dry land with all its varied occupants—God convened in solemn conclave the archangels and all the angelic host, and inquired of them if there still lacked the crowning touch, and their reply was: "There lacketh but one thing, a mouthpiece to the dumb creation, that there might ever ascend a perennial pæan of praise and thanksgiving to their Sovereign Lord." And in response, in the eternal council chambers of heaven, the Blessed Trinity passed the mandate for the creation of man in Their own image, and after Their own likeness. The creation of man is distinct from that of the animal world. After all the kinds of animal life are fashioned and made there is a pause—a solemn deliberation. And in obeyance to Divine command there arose from the earth a God-like man, the master-piece of creation, both as to his bodily organisation and mental endowments, erect in stature, that was to single him out as the lord of the lower universe; and endowed with an immortal soul in conjunction with the impress and breath of God, because "I will be his God, and he shall be my son"; and again, "I will be a Father unto you, and thy posterity will be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

Man now takes his position over created things, and like his Maker is a trinity in unity, being composed of body, soul, and spirit. It is significant to note the stress God placed upon the sacredness of human life, that after the sin of Cain the mandamus went forth: "Whosoever shall shed man's blood (violating the Divine Image), his blood shall be shed."

How much can the callous one learn from the truth-seeking Cicero living in darkness when he exclaims: "How many excellencies has God bestowed on mankind! He has raised him from the ground, and made him lofty and erect, that with an eye directed to heaven he might aspire to the knowledge of the Divine character."

Now listen to a modern; he says that man is born with some resemblance to his parents. And though this parental likeness may not be discernible during the years of health, yet, often when he is laid low on the bed of death, those dear and near have recognised for the first time that family likeness embossed and chiselled upon his countenance; and thus the Poet Laureate sings:—

> "As sometimes in a dead man's face,
> To those that watch it more and more,
> A likeness hardly seen before
> Comes out to someone of his race."

Man is also told, but by far greater authority, on the first page of the Pentateuch, that he is created after the image of his Father in heaven, God. And though this Divine parental image may have been obliterated in the present life by sin, may it be our portion after repentance and pardon, when our eyes have closed upon this earthly scene, these wrinkles that channel the human brow and scar and plough the cheek, occasioned by this transitory world's troubles, been softened and mellowed down; when haggard and perturbed looks, signs of a fallen world, have been toned down by the Divine Artist's brush of pardon and peace, sought and found by free grace in a Saviour's blood. Then, grant that the angelic hosts of heaven may perceive chiselled upon our calm, serene, and placid faces, illuminated in death by the reflection of the flood-gates of heaven's transcendent glory, the image and likeness of Him after whose likeness we were created.

But there is something far nobler than the outer resemblance. When we are asked our opinion of a person we hardly for a moment consider the outer man, our thoughts are instantaneously centred on the "EGO" or "I" of the individual; in other words, the *character*, which we refer to in conjunction with either piety, honesty of purpose, stability, sympathy, or perchance some opposite quality. And this character is what I purpose to take as the centre around which future thoughts shall revolve, or a focus towards which the shall gravitate and converge.

Our first thought must be with man on this side of the grave, who, "as the sparks fly upwards, is born to trouble." And there is no exaggeration in the assertion that man's first and last experience of life is that everything presents a hostile attitude towards him, that his environments are continually militating against him. Life must be, therefore, boldly faced, and these hostilities recognised and confronted. The question that presents itself is, What is man's action to be? and the reply is discovered in the truth enshrined in the lines:

> "Unless above himself he can erect himself,
> How small a thing is man."

Man is called upon to discipline his real self as to prove superior to temptation, pain, disabilities, bereavement, death; the powers within to be stronger than the foes warring from without. Opposition can be seen in most walks of life to be, contrary to expectation, a boon and not a hindrance. Obstruction creates a healthy condition of affairs, and so this importont and immortal essence, the *character*, is developed and matured in what might be designated mental strugglings. This implies

soldiery and active military service, but it is no new doctrine, as baptism enlisted us as soldiers under the banner of the Captain of our salvation. One thought bridges us to another. Look at the earthly soldier engaged in deadly combat, putting into operation every energy, his hearing deafened by the bullets whistling past his ears, and the fearful groans of the wounded and dying, enveloped with the smoke of the cannon, straining every nerve, forgetful of self, he fights for Queen and country. All the noble traits of his nature find expression; he is awarded the Victoria Cross, and we clap our hands with delight that the ancient courage and pluck and heroism have descended to the British warrior from a lion-hearted ancestry. But this has found vent under adverse circumstances, for is our admiration so evoked when our typical soldier is on his furlough under favourable circumstances?

Further, we glean from the writings of such men as Aristotle and Plato that man was made up of a duality; but it was not until Christ came to give fresh insight into the true dignity of humanity that man is taught to "preserve body, soul, and spirit blameless"—hence the tripartite nature of man. The eloquent Dean of Norwich observes: "If they dealt only with man's body, they were materialistic; if they neglected the body and looked only to the soul, then that would be transcendentalism; but if, while regarding man's body, they disregarded his spirit, then they were falsest of all to the principal realities of man." The song of thanksgiving that welled up from the depths of Mary's nature was: "My soul (ψυχη) doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit (πνευμα) hath rejoiced in God my Saviour." The soul referring to the mind, the passions, emotions; in short, all which is common to life. But the spirit that which is only possessed by man, the conscience; the point of touch between the human and the Divine. To present a difficult theme in a tangible form, let us liken the human body to an empire, the forces which would prove most mischievous, if left undirected, to the soul; and the spirit to the law, which is to be administered by the Holy Spirit and presided over by the King of Kings.

Presenting the doctrine in another form, it may be said that the body is sanctified when its instincts are governed by the spirit through the soul, and its members are made altogether the instruments of righteousness. To liken man to an empire is but to reduce an aggregate to a unit. The harvests of good and bad, which are to be seen in corporeal life, can be traced to seedlings in individual life. The spirit of man is called upon to subdue human passions, develop right and that which is pure and noble, to legislate and govern the soul, for—

"Man who man would be must rule the empire of himself
In it must be supreme, establishing his throne upon
a vanquished will,
Quelling anarchy of hopes and fears, being himself alone."

Or, again—

"One may conquer a thousand thousand men in battle,
But he who conquers himself alone is the greatest victor."

Man's primary object here is to glorify God, and, like every great man, to make the best use of everything at his disposal, to serve his Creator truly in that station of life in which He has been pleased to call him; if position be humble, and means few, to be buoyed up with the truth that the measure of responsibility will be gauged by the measure of the ability. Man finds himself in a world bristling with difficulties, but whether these hostilities will increase or crumble at his feet will depend very largely upon the way they are manipulated; the stone that will trip up one person may prove a stepping-stone across a river of difficulties to another. Instead of saying that man is a creature of circumstances, it would be nearer the mark to say that he is the architect of circumstances. "It is character which builds an existence out of circumstances. Thus it is that in the same family, in the same circumstances, one man rears a stately edifice, while his brother vacillating lives for ever amid ruins," so speaks a modern writer. Do we not recognise the truth in the following. Soon after the illustrious Edmund Burke had been making one of his most brilliant orations in Parliament, his brother Richard, who was always considered to be superior in natural talent, was found sitting in silent reverie, and when asked by a friend what he was thinking about, he replied, "I have been wondering how Ned has contrived to monopolise all the talent of our family; but then I remember that when we were doing nothing, or were at play, he was always at work." Here we have an instance of a man, though intellectually handicapped by discipline and self-mastery, superseding those whom nature had more richly endowed. But man's highest work is not in the erection of a temple to the god Intellect, but one fit for the Holy Ghost. And like the minute insect working under the sea, throwing up those white chalk cliffs at Dover, that become Albion's bulwarks against an enemy's invasion, so man's daily actions must be such as to form a character that can set at defiance every emergency. But it must be borne in mind that the insect pursues its mighty work quite imperceptibly, and so the building up of man's character is pursued in comparative silence, being made up of the tiniest details of daily life. I emphasise the daily details, for the morrow of every man is moulded by the yesterday, and one day, nay, any one minute, may leave its inheritance for ever. Recognising the importance of life may man live, as Apelles painted,—for eternity.

Man need not necessarily be influenced by his environments, but rather arise, phœnix-like, above evil surroundings, taking for his model Joseph, Moses, Daniel, St. Matthew and others.

"Why comes temptation but for man to meet
And master, and make crouch beneath his feet,
And so be pedestalled in triumph."

The inquiry is sometimes made that if affliction is sent to discipline man, how comes it that it sometimes ends in apparent failure, not only bringing about no change, but rather producing an opposite effect? I venture to advance two of many causes. First, we have occasional instances of a criminal who has lived a life of most daring crimes, and eventually been arrested, tried, condemned, and walked from the pinioning-room to the gallows, meeting death without the twitching of a single nerve. Now would that man be classed among brave and courageous heroes? I say the conduct borders upon reckless foolhardiness. Would it be further said that from such a case punishment is universally a failure? No. There is lacking the spirit of legitimate and sanctified fear. Such a man may be placed alongside those who have an imperfect manhood. Secondly, the Bible gives us sufficient evidence to say that "God's spirit will not always strive with man." St. Paul exhorts the Thessalonians, "Quench not the spirit," and directions to Timothy "to stir up (kindle or cause to burn) the gift of God which is in thee." Implying that grace can be withdrawn, hence we are not surprised that King Saul, for his hardness of heart, God's spirit left him and an evil spirit entered him. Or from want of exercise the spiritual germ may become paralysed and eventually die, as with Pharaoh, Saul, Judas Iscariot. Hence, affliction will act differently, like the fire that melts the iron and at the same time hardens the clay. We conclude, therefore, that as mankind generally do not fall within the first category, the solution must be sought within the wide limits of the second.

But there is another step in the subject of affliction which should be considered, and it is this: that it should not only teach the sufferer how to endure, but also that through those afflictions he is to glorify his Maker before the world. How often a sufferer is to be found who is compelled to lie on a bed of sickness, or in some way endure tribulation for years. Neighbours and relatives ask, "How can so and so bear it?" "Is life worth living?" And the reply takes the form of such fragments of the Scriptures as the following:—"We glory in tribulations also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh no ashamed because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."

Thus the poor sufferer is glorifying God by showing that an additional force, which is not earthly but spiritual, can be infused into a body racked with agony and pain.

Bishop Carpenter in his recent Bampton Lectures touches upon this theme when he says:—"Take the case of suffering which is inherited. The man is born blind, it is a hard case, no fault of his can be urged, but how does Christ interpret it? Through this infirmity of his the works of God were to be known (St. John ix.). If pain and weakness become the means of higher revelations to men, who will not be content to suffer? Human life becomes exalted as man recognises that not out of caprice, but for the sake of making man through pain the instrument of good to others, does suffering enter into his lot. If the blow which causes the string to quiver as in pain brings forth music to make men glad, the thrill of anguish is abundantly repaid. Did we know what power lies in weakness we should, like the Apostle, glory in our infirmities."

As the part man is called upon to play in life's drama is to be the *rôle* of the conqueror, let us take a few troubles which every child of Adam must sooner or latter be called upon to encounter, illustrating, in some cases, a remedy by an anecdote, "for truth embodied in a tale will enter in at lowly doors." For convenience I will call them ordeals of life which will be classified into constant and periodical.

1. The monk that shook the world once exclaimed, "I am more afraid of my own self than of the Pope and all his cardinals; I have within me the great Pope—Self." "Man has," said St. Austin, "a microcosm, a little world within his breast." He is proned by nature to establish an unbounded tyranny in contradiction to the will of God. The truest potentate is being king of one's own self. The highest sovereignty is that of the Christian who can say, "He has made us kings unto God." The truest hero is he whose soul is "bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." Or, in the old saying of Sir Thos. Browne: "Lead thine own captivity captive, and be Cæsar within thyself." The greatest nobility lies in having led your own captivity captive, and of being Cæsar in the empire God has given you—the kingdom of yourselves. This rule of conduct need not necessarily militate with that pregnant little story of the Englishman and Irishman desirous of extracting themselves out of a certain trouble, the latter crying, "Who will help *me* out of the difficulty?" while the former said, "How can *I* get out of the difficulty?"

While sinking self for the spirit of Christ man must not banish his individual responsibility to God. He can consider with profit the device found on an ancient medal representing a bullock standing between a plough and an altar, with the inscription, "Ready for either—for toil or for sacrifice." Man, if he is to succeed, has to toil in the spirit of Michael Angelo working for a week without taking off his clothes, of Handel hollowing out every note of his harpsicord, like a spoon, by incessant practice. The law given to Adam that he should eat bread by the sweat of his brow

was a most beneficent one, and Christ, by ennobling labour, showed us that toil is the salt of life, preserving the body from effeminate langour, and the soul from unhealthy broodings. Thus, He set us an example in that toil from boyhood upwards in the carpenter's shop, and in that labour of love afterwards to save the world.

True is the adage that a man will rust out sooner than he will wear out. Success will tend to create an empire of self within if it be not counterbalanced with the spirit of sacrifice; the Christian will only regard "the law of accumulation in proportion to the law of distribution;" a man is at his best when he begins to transmit his good influence to others.

2. Closely associated with self is sin; the direct connection will be shown presently. In the meantime let us analyse sin in the words of the erudite divine, F. W. Robertson: "In every act of sin," he says, "there are two distinct steps; there is the rising of a desire which is natural, and being natural, is not wrong; there is the indulgence of the desire in forbidden circumstances, and that is sin." In other words, there is nothing wrong in being tempted, if checked; but if, on the other hand, the temptation is cherished, it becomes sin.

> "'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
> Another thing to fall."

Joseph was tempted to violate the seventh commandment; we watch the mental strugglings going on in the moral palaestra, and recognising his relationship to God, he conquers. At another epoch of history David is tempted, and we too well know the result. It is the devil's game to suggest, it is man's disciplined character to resist, not in his own strength, but in the power of Him who, being tempted in all points for man's sake, conquered.

Let us take another aspect in the words of the poetical Bishop of Ripon. We are told that the definition of sin is selfishness. "It is the following of our own hearts and passions and desires, heedless of right and heedless of the good or well-being of others. It becomes instantly apparent that love is the true antagonist of this spirit. "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Love is the antidote of selfishness; selfishness establishes an empire of sin; love will establish the kingdom of God within.

The many-headed monster is the animalism within the heart dethroning the true man. May we deduce a lesson from the familiar scene of the man on horseback, and say that that is what should be, the beast below and the man above. He who loves sin, sin slays, for "the wages of sin is death." Nothing is more patent, either from a physical or spiritual platform, than that Nemesis, the daughter of Nox, brings retribution after the violation of God's commandments; so we see sorrow dogging the heels of sin. "The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices make instruments to scourge us."

3. "Love thy neighbour as thyself," so runs the divine injunction, which carries us on to another thought, causing us to ponder and reflect how much happier the voyage of life would be if we only would more and more win, judging from our little standpoint, the peculiarities of our fellow-travellers by love, rather than alienating them from us by asserting, what we love to call, the satisfaction of upholding the dignity of self. Cannot we, as spiritual soldiers, learn a lesson from the greatest of earthly warriors, Alexander the Great, who, after he quelled numerous seditions, conquered Thrace, destroyed Thebes, subdued Asia Minor, mastered Egypt and Persia, and the enormous vastitudes of India, on being asked how he had been able at so early an age and in so short a period to conquer such vast regions and establish so great a name, replied, "I use my enemies so well that I compel them to be my friends, and I treat my friends with such constant regard that they become unalterably attached to me." Our differences with contemporaries are often eminated through misunderstandings which directs us to cultivate the habit of trying to get behind the thoughts of men, and to behold from their view-point, to see eye to eye, and if we have a nobler creed endeavour to raise them to a higher range of conception. In addition to this, there is that determination to discern the best *in* every man, and to think the best *of* every man with that brotherly feeling which "hopeth all things, believeth all things, and endureth all things." Hence, gentleness will prove more potent than herculean strength. "What thou wilt, thou rather shall enforce it with a smile than hew to it with my sword."

4. We now pass on to what may be styled as the disabilities of life, and we ask what would the world have known of the gigantic intellects of such engineers as Brunel and George Stephenson had there been no such things as impediments. Physical obstacles have ever evoked man's highest faculties, either to lay them at their feet or turn them to good account. So also it may be admitted that man has to combat spiritual disabilities, and either to vanquish or to convert them to his spiritual advantage. When William the Conqueror landed on our native shores previous to the battle of Hastings, as he was in the act of disembarking, his foot gave way on the shingly beach causing him to fall forward on his hands, at which misadventure his soldiers raised a cry of distress. "An evil omen," they sighed, "is here." "See, my lords," replied William, "by the splendour of God I have taken possession of England with both my hands; it is now mine, and what is mine is yours." The inference is patent.

In reading the biographies of notable people nothing is more discernible than how men have

had this particular disabilities to teach them, may we say humility, or some other virtue. Milton, in a noble passage of "Paradise Lost," rejoices at what is left to him when he sings, "Does God exact day labour, light denied?" And in another passage he tells his friends that his eyes

"Their seeing have forgot;
Not to their idle orbs doth sight appear,
Of sun, or moon, or stars throughout the year,
Or man or woman. Yet I argue not
Against heaven's hand or will, nor bate a jot
Of heart or hope, but still bear up and steer
Right onward."

Such were the words of the illustrious blind poet of our own parish of Aldersgate.

We recollect Handel, in his age and blindness, full of cheerful dignity. Of the deaf musician Beethoven, who in the prime of life lost his hearing; though we love to think of the resignation which illuminated anguish, hope which triumphed over death, his last words on earth being, "I shall hear in heaven." Of Bach, and the awe-inspiring music which was the outcome of his poverty-stricken youth. Of Dean Stanley of Westminster, who has been described as being by nature so shy and timid as to be awkward and unhappy in the society of strangers, but who cured himself in a great measure by endeavouring to discover the wishes of others, and so built up that personal character which in latter years was so courted by rich and poor. Nor can it be forgotten how St. Paul became superior to his thorn in the flesh, his soul bursting forth in that song of hope, "For this light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Man if animated by the spirit of Christ, the Man of Affliction, the Saviour will clothe the disabilities of His brethren with heavenly significance, bestowing a pleasant savour to unsweet duties, redeeming life by dispersing its mysterious fogs, and kindling an auroral glow of hope athwart its horizon.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noses in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

IN the autumn last year there was brought forward by Messrs. Christy & Co., 25, Lime St., E.C., an article of great importance for the treatment of coughs, bronchitis, and other complaints of the respiratory organs and the lungs, and particularly suited to the time of year. This article is a natural product in the shape of a honey extracted by the small black bee that feeds upon the eucalyptus trees growing in the Australian Colonies; eucalyptus honey is sweet, pleasant to the taste, and possesses the characteristic flavour and odour of the eucalyptus essences. Medical men are now recommending it very largely, as they find it successful in bronchitis, coughs, whooping cough, etc., and it appears to us to be a product that should find its way into every home, especially where the children are sufferers, as it is pleasant for them to take, and at the same time very effective.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1890.

NON-MILITARY HISTORIES.

THE Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lord Salisbury, has, on various occasions, uttered expressions of a gratifying nature, from a pacific point of view, as, for example, when he spoke of the value of large maps as aids in counteracting timid fears and international jealousy, and especially so in reference to the frontiers of Russia in Central Asia, which are much more distant from the borders of British India than many ignorant alarmists suppose them to be.

Recently, the Premier, in addressing a meeting of Electricians, threw out the suggestive idea that history might, with much more advantage than hitherto, be written, not so exclusively from a mere military or dynastic point of view, but rather in its especial relation to great revolutionising discoveries of science, industry, and economy. Thus, instead of indicating successive ages by the names of the principal wars, or battles, which marked them, it would be far more interesting and instructive to regard them as being the ages, respectively, of the School-men, the great Church Architects, the Printing Press, Steam, Gas, Photography, Electricity, and such like discoveries, which have already so powerfully modified the lives and interests of nations.

Although this idea is by no means new to the friends of Peace, yet it is one which people in general are by no means adequately familiarised with. And hence it is of importance that it should have obtained the benefit and publicity necessarily attending a speech from the Prime Minister of this country.

It is satisfactory to note that such a wider and

more liberal understanding of the real character of history has already, during the present century, made considerable progress; and further, that it has been carried out into practical observance by some popular and influential writers.

A generation or more ago, that intelligent author and publisher, Mr. Charles Knight, in his interesting and comprehensive "History of England," gave a prominence very unusual, if not indeed unprecedented at that period, to the subjects of national Industry, Art, Literature, Architecture, Philanthropy, and Social Life. The continuation of that work, under the title of the "History of the Thirty Years' Peace," by Harriet Martineau, was marked, in still greater degree, by its share of attention to pacific and social, as distinguished from merely military or naval topics. The great French Statesman, M. Guizot, in his "History of Civilization in Europe," set a similar good example to other writers.

At a more recent date, Mr. J. R. Green has imparted to English history a greatly increased interest and influence, from the special prominence which he has given to the social and pacific departments of the national development. On a smaller scale, an attempt, by no means unsuccessful, has been made by Mr. Josiah W. Leeds, of Pennsylvania, to present the "History of the United States" under similar aspects. And gradually the popular taste is thus being usefully educated in this direction. An increasing number of readers now turn with disgust from the old class of histories, which dealt so exclusively with the achievements of the soldier, or the dynastic or political adventurer. This sort of literature tends gradually to become associated, in the minds of intelligent persons, with the category of publications kindred with the low sporting papers and pothouse journals, which contained extended and gushing reports of brutal fisticuffs, cowardly prize-fights, dog-fights, and badger-baitings, described with all the appropriate slang and vulgarity befitting such matters.

The "glory and glory" histories of former annalists are becoming the subjects of more intelligent estimate, also, in proportion as popular education is extending and the public taste is becoming elevated.

There is, however, one modern influence which still needs great reform in this direction, and that is the Newspaper Press. Some Editors and Proprietors of public journals are men of humanity and disinterested pacific patriotism, but others are actuated by grosser and sordid motives, and in order to increase the circulation of their papers, at any cost to their country and to its best interests, they do not hesitate, whenever occasion offers, to pander to the lowest passions and to stir up bitter international jealousies, which would be altogether contemptible, if they were not so perilously fraught with the gravest mischief and disaster.

Some progress has, however, been made, and encouraging successes attained, even in this form of contemporary history. But very much remains to be yet striven for and accomplished before popular journalism will have become more generally creditable to the national character, or more satisfactory to enlightened Christian patriotism.

Reviews and Notices.

"SERMONS ON THE PROPHETS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT." By Rev. Julius Lloyd, Hon. Canon of Manchester. London: Geo. Bell & Sons, 1889.
"MANTLE AND STAFF." By Rev. J. R. Gillies. London: James Nisbet & Co.

WE hold the recognition of the value of the teaching of the Hebrew prophets by writers and preachers of the present day to be a healthy sign of the times. Even rationalism, although it denies prophecy in the modern misleading sense, yet grants the truer sense when (as it generally does) it admits prophetic insight, and thereby rationalism concedes more than it thinks. For prophetic "insight" never was merely of events, which many who were far from being prophets have had, but of the *issue* of events, and that they show a Divine governance of the world. When, therefore, the rationalist admits "insight," it must be in the form that prophets claimed it.

Both the volumes before us have prophetic teaching for their subject, especially Canon Lloyd's. And both treat the prophets as "guides"—Canon Lloyd uses that very word. Moreover both bring prophetic teaching to bear on the events, and even more on the morals of the present day, but in very different styles. Those who love a calm, judicial manner, will prefer Canon Lloyd's well-balanced sentences; those who like fire and enthusiasm, yet with thought too, will prefer Mr. Gillies. Perhaps we may be wrong, but we should say it is a pity the preachers could not have changed congregations—at any rate as far as the first of our volumes is concerned. Canon Lloyd's sermons seem to have been preached in Oldham, a town of immense mills, having a population of immense enterprise—the sort of people who, like their oratory, to be immensely energetic too; we fancy the Oldham folk would prefer Mr. Gillies. We have no preference, we can see advantages in both. Both are good; Mr. Gillies rouses, Canon Lloyd interests; Mr. Gillies would have you *feel*, Canon Lloyd would have you *know*. But their manner is very different. Compare, for instance, these two passages:—

"In working for God we are tempted sometimes to use questionable means to attain ends in themselves good, to secure popularity, not for ourselves, but for our goodness, by some concession of principle, the slightest suspicion of a lie. Worship the Devil? Never! But why not lift your hat to the Devil as he rolls by you in his carriage, or wishes you good morning across the street? Why not leave your card for him if he is a person of some consequence and lives on the Heath? In the name of all that is sweetly reasonable and decently civil, why not? If you can cheat the Devil into doing God a service, is it not a good thing done? No, it is not, and never can be. Good can never come out of evil. God's kingdom can never stand on the semblance of a lie. It is

written, "Thou shall worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."—"Mantle and Staff," p. 39.

Now hear Canon Lloyd :—"The disposition in the human mind which tends to worship power has its highest visible objects in the elemental powers of the universe. More especially the sun was worshipped by heathens of various races as the source of light and life. Money again is practically a god to those who covet wealth more than heaven, and dread poverty more than hell. Mammon worship is not a mere figure of speech, but a true description of a prevalent sin. It is not that one man in a thousand frankly sets before himself the determination to be rich in this world, whatever it may cost him in the world to come. Men rarely act with so fixed a purpose, whether for good or for evil. But the love of money steals into the soul insidiously, and becomes part of it unawares."—Sermons, p. 65.

Now both these extracts condemn the same sort of fault, but in how different a manner. Mr. Gillies becomes almost personal; Canon Lloyd almost loses the preacher in the essayist. Yet we will not go so far as to say, Hear one and read the other ; we would rather say, Read both ; and to the preacher, Imitate neither, but be natural.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

SIR,—I wish to make a short statement in reference to some of the remarks I find in the PULPIT of this date.

Mr. Walker says he prefers to accept the plain and simple teachings of God's Word. Does he suppose that no one except himself and his party can judge what is declared in the Sacred Volume? The Universalists maintain that the plain and simple teachings of God's Word do not inculcate the doctrine of eternal punishment. Some of the most eminent among the earliest Christian writers seem to have held the same opinion, and many of them read those teachings in their native tongue.

In regard to purgatory, I do not profess to hold the views of the Roman Catholics. But to my mind, the conclusion is inevitable, that if *all things* are reconciled to God, which in 1 Col. clearly means all intelligent beings, the work of reconciliation must be carried on beyond the confines of this life. Some are reconciled in this life, but no sane man supposes that all men are united to Christ before death.

I do not agree with Mr. Walker, that arguments about the eternity of punishment are time and ink wasted. The difference between the two classes of views and doctrines is enormous. If the Universalists are right, their opponents must be calumniating God, and poisoning the most wholesome and kindly emotions of human beings. How can a man truly and heartily love God, if he believes that the Saviour is capable of regarding endless depravity and misery with serene composure, when He died to procure boundless and most efficacious remedies? How can he cherish sentiments of Brotherhood, if he has a hearty conviction that a large proportion of Adam's race will be accursed of God for ever? I am striving against such views with earnest perseverance, because it seems clear to me that they have for centuries diffused throughout Christendom an atmosphere of malignity, darkness, and unrighteousness.

Your correspondent who makes a number of enquiries in regard to the belief of Universalists respecting the Atonement, ought, when he charges his opponents with holding or not holding certain opinions, to bring forward proofs in support of his assertions, instead of calling on them to answer a series of questions. To all the questions he puts, I answer *Yes*. I quite agree with Rev. Thos. Allin, the author of "Primitive Universalism," that "precisely as we teach the larger hope, so precisely do we honour the Atonement." Our opponents practically restrict the benefits of the Atonement to the elect, while we declare that those benefits will be universal.

J. B.

Canonbury, 22nd February, 1890.

SIR,—Your esteemed correspondent, Mr. Sandlands, requests me to answer seven questions categorically and straight, without beating about the bush. He prefaces this request, which I cannot call modest, and which I will not call the reverse, with as straight an admission as it is possible to make, that in what I stated in my last I was correct. Unable to contradict me, he has recourse to the method that he pursues ; which method is, to draft a set of questions that he appears to intend to be entrapping, and to argue in future communications to you from my answers to them. Has it ever occurred to him that it is a very easy way to deal with an unwary antagonist, to put a question which itself contains, either the wished-for answer, or, what is worse, a *suggestio falsi?*

It would be quite proper for me to reply, if I should think there were any occasion to do so, by calling on him for proofs by quotations to overthrow my assertion ; that assertion being, that two of the Universalist writers whom I mention, and others whom I do not mention, do, notwithstanding their Universalism, hold and teach the Christian doctrine of Atonement. But I waive my right, and proceed to answer Mr. Sandland's queries, premising that I answer, not for the imaginary Universalist that he supposes, but for those of that way of thinking whose writings I am acquainted with in so far as I apprehend them.

1st. The doctrine of the Atonement implies the universal depravity of the human race. Does the Universalist admit this? Answer. — Yes ; and not only every Universalist, but every man, Christian or heathen, who has ever thought for an hour on ethical subjects, admits it.

2nd. It (the doctrine of Atonement) implies that man has no help in himself. Does the Universalist believe this? Answer.—Certainly he does.

3rd. It implies that salvation is all of sovereign grace. Does the Universalist believe this? Answer. —He does, most fully and absolutely.

4th. It maintains that faith, which is the means by which the benefits of the Atonement are applied, is the gift of God. Does the Universalist believe this? Answer.—He does, most fully and absolutely.

5th. It holds that faith depends for its exercise on the will of man being submitted to the sovereign will of God. Does the Universalist believe this? Answer. —So far as I understand this question, and so far as I identify its terms with my ideas of "the will of man" and "the will of God," Universalists certainly do believe this.

6th. The exercise of faith in the Atonement is accompanied with a holy life, etc. Does the Universalist believe this? Answer.—None of the writers that I speak of in the foregoing part of my letter treat of what is here suggested. If they believe what is here set forward, they believe what is contrary to fact of experience. There are, most unhappily, multitudes who believe the Atonement, and who do not lead a holy life.

7th. The Atonement saves from hell and saves for heaven. Does the Universalist hold this? Answer. —If there is anything that Universalists hold more absolutely and more entirely than people of other ways of thinking, it is this. Indeed, their complaint of those who differ from them is, that those others hold this doctrine only in part, but that they (Universalists) hold it in whole.

I was about to conclude this by signing my name to it, when I cast my eye on the last paragraph of Mr. Sandland's letter. "Does not Mr. Lawrence see," he asks, "what is perfectly plain, that it is impossible for any Universalist to hold the doctrine of the Atonement?" The meaning of this question is, that in Mr. Sandland's opinion the Christian doctrine of the Atonement and the Universalist notion (which I myself do not hold) are inconsistent with each other. But as I know for a fact that many Universalists do actually believe, and believe most earnestly, that holy doctrine, it goes for nothing in relation to that fact that this, that, or the other man thinks it inconsistent of them so to believe. Is your esteemed correspondent quite certain that he himself is altogether exempt from inconsistency? If he is, he is the only man I ever heard of that is.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

22nd February, 1890.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

SIR,—The question that Mr. Donaldson puts, why should any man go to hell? he says he has never yet got an answer to. He says that I cannot answer it. I can, however, try. I believe that no man should go to hell if it be within the Divine power to prevent him. St. Peter tells us in his second epistle, that it is not the Lord's will that any should perish, but that all should attain repentance. He says even more than that, such is the Divine will; for the word is *βουλομενός*, which appears to imply counsel or purpose as well as will (*θέλημα*). But it may be that there are moral or spiritual impossibilities unto God, as there are impossibilities in nature and science; and that the Divine purpose may be eternally marred by the exercise of men's self-will.

From some of Mr. Donaldson's expressions, I am disposed to apprehend that his idea of salvation, as commonly spoken of in the Bible, is not the idea intended in the Bible. In his letter dated 28th January, I read: "God says, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, from endless misery by being put in possession of endless happiness." Now the quotation here is from what St. Paul said to the gaoler, and not from what God said; and there is nothing about being saved from endless misery. What salvation means is I think to be found in Matt. i. 21. "Thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins." Salvation, that is, from sin itself, and of course, from its punishment also; but first and most and greatest, from sin itself. If salvation means nothing but to be saved from punishment, this I say with no reserve is not the Gospel; and to preach it will not tend to make men righteous.

I would make some remarks on your correspondent's style, but one should not expect too much from a man that has hell on the brain.

B.

IS OUR LORD A JUDGE, OR MERELY AN ADVOCATE?

SIR,—It is time that this question should be sifted to the very chaff. It has now got into the secular Press (see *Contemporary* for this month), so it is time for the theological to speak. For a long time we were satisfied to rely on Old Testament utterances, as we do on old Acts of Parliament, or *dicta* of Judges. But now we are told, that "divers manners" means divers degrees of authority. Still, we took comfort from the words "hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." We thought fondly that this was to be "an end of all strife." But, alas! we are undeceived. We are to "draw a clear distinction between those great truths, which are the essence of the faith, and all other facts and doctrines. Can any seriously-minded Christian put the Resurrection of our Lord, as a fact on a level with the literal truth of the story of Jonah? If the former be not true, our faith is vain; if the latter be proved a parable, how does the spiritual life of any Christian suffer?" This is strange argument! Who ever said that the fact of our Lord's Resurrection was only of equal value with the other of the history of Jonah? Whoever said that God may not teach by parables, as our Lord indeed constantly did? This is only beating about the bush. The question is this, when our Lord speaks, does He speak as of Himself, or as reporting from the Father? "The word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me." Yet we are gravely told that His words may be set aside. "We are not to seek in His utterances authentic decisions on moot points of history or criticism. . . . We are not to settle historical questions by quoting an authority which had nothing to do with these questions, and never really touched them. . . . The outer shell or husk, it was not His province to investigate." I quote from a published sermon. The glibness with which limits are here put to "His province" is really astonishing. Who was His Counsellor? as Job asks. But all doctrines are not excluded from this shell or husk, reserved from His province. The essence of the faith is alone His province, all other facts and doctrines are reserved. Now this is exactly what Socinians have always said, only excluding doctrines, and confining His authority to morals. And Quakers, in like manner, exclude all about Sacraments. It all comes to this. Is our Lord to be heard as a mere advocate, or as a final Judge? We are now told that the Rabbis thought this or that about Jonah's history. I will not say, who cares what they thought? *I care a great deal.* Because if they taught that Jonah's story was only a fable, our Lord's treating it as history comes with far more force, because He had heard their pleading before He pronounced sentence. It was a point "then mooted," and, therefore, we are to seek His decision. If the final Court hears all that Sir Charles Russell or Mr Sexton has to say before deciding, does not that make its decision the more authentic? It is a comfort to think that our Lord,

when treating the repentance of the Ninevites on the preaching of the miraculous prophet as a true history, had heard all the rubbish which the Rabbis could adduce. The whole story of Jonah must go together. If there was no miracle, why did the Ninevites hear him? If they neither heard nor repented, how can they rise against us in the judgment? If they are not to rise, is there to be any judgment at all? I am sure these German theologians do not wish to shake our faith in a judgment to come, nor in our Lord's Resurrection. But, nevertheless, their arguments have that effect. If all history is a mere fable and moral discourse, we stand much as if God had not given us anything in either Testament of an historic form. We are little better off than Socrates, Plato, or Aristotle—arguing from *à priori* positions as to right or wrong, a future life and future retribution.

Almost the whole of our Lord's teaching is founded on reference to the Old Testament. Are such references inspired, or are they only of as much value as anyone else's? This has to be decided. It is as well to remark in what a judicial tone our Lord speaks, after repeating what the Scribes and Pharisees as advocates said, He as the judge sums up.—"But I say unto you": *Locutus est judex, causa finita est.*

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

February 25th, 1890.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—The following quotation from Dr. Salmon's admirable "Introduction to the New Testament" is of interest. The opinion of so widely read and so sober a critic is of weight. :—

"Dr. Hobart sometimes pushes his argument too far, forgetting that medical writers must employ ordinary as well as technical language, and therefore that every word frequently found in medical books cannot fairly be claimed as a term in which medical writers can be supposed to have an exclusive property. *But when every doubtful instance has been struck out of Dr. Hobart's lists, enough remain to establish completely what he desires to prove*," p. 143, 4th ed., Murray, 1889. I believe this to be quite correct.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, February 24th, 1890.

THE Dean of Bangor, who has been lying seriously ill at the residence of Colonel M'Corquodale, Newton-le-Willows, was on Saturday sufficiently restored to health to be able to return home.

THE *Banner* says that the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, B.A., who has been appointed general secretary to the S.P.C.K., was born at Bombay in 1861, and lived for many years in France, Germany and Italy, and spent three years in Natal. "Having worked for two years at Glasgow University, he went after an interval to Oxford, where, in 1883, he gained a history exhibition at Exeter College. In 1886 he took his B.A., with a First Class in the History School, and a Second Class in the Theological School in 1888. He was president of the Union in the Easter term of 1888, and was known as a strong Liberal Unionist in politics. Mr. Carlyle was ordained deacon and licensed to a curacy at St. Stephen's, Westminster, under Archdeacon Sinclair in 1888, and received priest's orders in 1889."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baines, Rev. F. S., M.A., Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Holbeck; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Chapel-Allerton, Leeds.
Bardsley, Rev. John, Curate of Wigton, Carlisle; Vicar of Holme St. Cuthbert, Maryport.
Benison, Rev. E. D., B.A., Vicar of St. James's, Pokesdown, Bournemouth.
Claxton, Rev. H. A., M.A., Vicar of Gildersome, Leeds.
Cowley, Rev. D. S., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Wakefield; Vicar of Kirk German, Isle of Man.
Cronshaw, Rev. Herbert P., Curate of Mossley Hill, Liverpool; Junior Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Diocese of Exeter and Domestic Chaplain to Sir T. D. Acland.
Fawcett, Rev. Francis L'Estrange, B.A., Curate of St. Martin's, Birmingham; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Luton.
Fawkes, Rev. F., M.A., Vicar of Rothwell; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Flynn, Rev. Francis, Chaplain to the *Euphrates*.
Fownes, Rev. John Edward Curtis, M.A., Assistant-Curate of Christ Church, St. Leonard's-on-Sea.
Hall, Rev. Henry N. G., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Whitechapel; Chaplain of Brompton Hospital.
Hayes, Rev. W. A., M.A., Incumbent of St. Peter's, Scaitcliffe, Accrington.
Hicks, Rev. E., Chaplain of Billesdon Union Workhouse.
Hill, Rev. P. Oakley, Vicar of Upton, Norfolk; Diocesan Inspector of Schools for Blofield Deanery (North Division).
Hillyard, Rev. Edward Augustus, B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Belper; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.
Holderness, Rev. H. J., B.A., Missions to Seamen Chaplain in Portland Roads.
Jellicoe, Rev. G. S., M.A., Incumbent of St. John's, Littlehampton; Vicar of Marcham-with-Garford, near Abingdon, Berks.
Law, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Rotherham; Lecturer for the Parish of Rotherham.
Austen-Leigh, Rev. Arthur H., Rector of Winterbourn, near Bristol; Vicar of Wargrave, Berks.
Leverton, Rev. Henry Lewis, Vicar of Mawnan, Cornwall.
Lloyd, Rev. F. C., Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Ponder's End; Vicar of Cholsey, Berks.
Makepeace, Rev. C. D., M.A., Vicar of Aldringham-with-Thorpe, Suffolk.
Matthews, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Curate of Knaresborough; Rector of Hedgerley, Bucks.
Owen, Rev. John Stanley, M.A., Vicar of St. Alkmund's, Derby; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.
Palmer, Rev. A. W. W., Curate of South Ashford; Secretary of the Chichester Diocesan Branch of the C.E.T.S.
Parker, Rev. T. B. J., B.A., Rector of Whitfield, Northamptonshire.
Pride, Rev. James Allen, M.A., Head Master of Neath Proprietary School and Curate of Neath; Vicar of Christ Church, Wakefield.
Proctor, Rev. Charles James, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Clapham; Vicar of St. Peter's, Islington.
Richardson, Rev. T., M.A., Canon of Adam Dekensal in St. Asaph Cathedral.
Richmond, Rev. Wilfrid J., M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools for the Cheshire Diocese; Vicar of Birtles, Cheshire.
Stacey, Rev. Ernest Lloyd, Curate of St. Polycarp's, Everton, Liverpool.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Alexander, Rev. Richard Dobson, Rector of South Pool, at South Pool Rectory, South Devon, on the 22nd inst., aged 58.
Bowen, Rev. Croasdaile, Archdeacon of Christchurch, New Zealand, at Riccarton Parsonage, Christchurch, New Zealand, on the 3rd inst.
Davies, Rev. David, Rector of Claverton, near Bath, at 9, Victoria Road, on the 20th inst., aged 94.
D'Aeth, Rev. Charles John Hughes, Rector of Cardynham, Cornwall, at Torquay, on the 20th inst., aged 63.
Gape, Rev. Charles, M.A., for many years Vicar of Sibsey and Willoughton, Lincolnshire, at 11, Exeter Road, Brondesbury, on the 24th inst., aged 90.
Hodgkinson, Rev. Robert John, Rector of Trowell, for many years connected with Uppingham School as Master and Trustee, at Trowell Rectory, Nottingham, on the 18th inst.
Webb, Rev. William James, M.A., Vicar, at 18, Alrewas Vicarage, on the 18th inst., aged 45.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.—II.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington, Hants.

A Course of Sermons preached in Lymington Church during Lent.

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the Devil."—Matt. iv. 1.

WE resume the consideration of that solemn and mysterious subject to which I called your attention on Sunday morning last, the temptation of our Lord Jesus Christ in the wilderness. It is true I left you in a wilderness—the lone and dreary wilderness—but I left you in company with Jesus, and where He is there should His people be also. Be it the wilderness, or the crowded city—at home or abroad—in sickness or in health, where Jesus is all is, all must be well. It is not place but grace that constitutes the safety of the Christian. It is true Satan was there, but the great Captain of our Salvation—He who "hath conquered him that had the power of death, that is, the devil"—was there, and when the great Commander leads the way, the soldiers of the Cross should follow the path of duty, though straight and thorny is the path of safety, "our profession is to follow Christ and to be made like unto Him"—carry this principle with you, my brethren, abide ever with Jesus. Seek to know more of Him, especially in "the fellowship of His sufferings," so shall you be "strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might." May His Spirit lead us into all truth while we consider

I. The object of Satan in tempting Jesus.

II. The object of the Spirit in leading Him to be tempted of the devil.

1. In considering the object of Satan in the temptation before us, I observe first that there are some who think that the primary object of Satan was to ascertain whether Jesus was really the Christ the Son of God, and that Saviour that should come into the world. It may be so. We must remember that the temptation of Christ took place at the commencement of His public ministry, immediately after His baptism in the river of Jordan when "Jesus began to be about thirty years of age," and that the whole of the life of Jesus up to that time had been spent in obscurity and seclusion, living in Nazareth, a village in the north of Galilee, where his parents resided, known as the carpenter's son, and indeed probably working at the trade of a carpenter, as upon one occasion His opponents objected, "Is not this the carpenter," there was probably little to distinguish Him from other pious young people, or to mark Him out as the Saviour that should come into the world. It is true His birth had been miraculous, but this may probably have been lost sight of or forgotten, except by his pious mother. With the single exception of His appearance in the temple at twelve years of age, and there remaining with the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions, so that all "were astonished at His understanding and answers," the Spirit of God has absolutely revealed to us nothing of the early days of Christ; under these circumstances, it is thought by some that even the devil himself was not certain as to whether this man was the Son of God, and therefore that his first object was to make sure of this, and the expression "if thou be the Son of God" would seem in some measure to favour this view. But, on the other hand, it should be remembered that Satan was not ignorant of the prophecies of the Old Testament that marked the character, time, and circumstances of the birth of the Messiah; that he had seen and heard the announcement of the angel and the multitude of the heavenly host that burst forth into the morning song of His birth on the fields of Bethlehem; that he had stirred up Herod to destroy Him, and that he had seen the Spirit of God descend in a bodily shape like a dove upon Him, and heard the voice from heaven saying, "this is My Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." We can hardly, therefore, think that Satan was at this time doubtful of the real nature of the Saviour's person and glory. Still, as he knew that He was a man, subject to the wants and weaknesses of humanity, he might hope, and probably did hope, by adapting his temptations with unseen and terrible subtlety to the circumstances of the case, or by transforming himself, as he probably did, into an angel of light, and by expressing sympathy and interest with the work and sufferings of the Saviour, to lead him into some slight but unlawful compliance with his wishes, and thus by one act of transgression on the Saviour's part to ruin for ever the great work of man's redemption, for he knew well that He who would be a fit substitute for the guilty must be Himself without blemish, "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." If, therefore, he could succeed in casting one stain of guilt on the Saviour's character his object was gained, redemption was ruined, and man was lost for ever; and even if he could not succeed in this his terrible object, he would at least have the wicked satisfaction of vexing the righteous soul of the Redeemer by the nearness and foulness of his temptations. In this indeed he succeeded, when in the deep agony of His soul the Saviour, "with strong crying and tears, made known His requests unto God, and was heard in that He feared."

And thus it is that the devil still assaults the fol-

lowers of Jesus, especially in the early days of their conversion to God, testing the reality and sincerity of their profession, tempting them to sin, vexing their souls with dark doubts, or sinful suggestings if by any means he might lead them to doubt the goodness of God or express impatience under the continued attacks of the wicked one; but, blessed be God, we have now an High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us, therefore, come boldly to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need."

2. But now let us consider the object of the Holy Spirit in leading Him to be tempted of the devil.

And first I would say it probably was on account of the devil himself. And here we are led reverently to ask who was the devil? What do the Scriptures say of him? It is probable he was the leader of those fallen spirits who kept not their first estate, and were cast down from heaven. And yet there is some difficulty here; for St. Peter says of them that were "cast down to hell, and delivered into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Whereas of the devil it is said that "he goeth to and fro in the earth, and walketh up and down in it," and that "he goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour;" but whoever he be—and there is an awful mystery that hangs over his being and existence—he is the inveterate enemy of God and man, a spirit of terrible power and wickedness. Yet the diligent reader of the Bible will not fail to observe that he is never spoken of lightly in book-word, but that a kind of respect is paid to him. Thus he is called "the god of this world, the devil of the power of the air, the spirit that worketh in the hearts of the children of disobedience." Now be it remembered that the Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, to bind and finally destroy the devil himself, and thus to deliver his captive people from the chains of his slavery; therefore, it was necessary that "the strong man armed" should be met and conquered on his own chosen field of battle by "the stronger than he," that every knee —inclusive of the great enemy himself—should bow before the throne of the Redeemer's sway, and that Satan himself should be silenced. For this end (in some measure at least) it would appear that Satan was permitted to tempt Job. "Hast thou considered thy servant Job," saith God Himself, addressing Satan, "that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil;" and then in answer to his bitter retort, "Doth Job fear God for nought?" he is permitted to tempt him. It was meet, therefore, that the great Captain of our salvation should meet that champion who defied the armies of the living God in order that Satan himself might be constrained to confess that having come he had "found nothing in Jesus. The "accuser of the brethren" can lay nothing to His charge.

But, again, the temptation was needful on account of Christ Himself. We read that "it became Him for Whom are all things and by Whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." And, again, we are told that, "though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered." Not that we are for a moment to suppose that the blessed Jesus was ever otherwise than obedient and perfect, but in the difficult field of temptation He learned to practise and exhibit before God and man the fulness of His obedience and the perfection of His nature; He was thus, as Mediator, made perfect through sufferings, and able to succour them that are tempted; "able," not in the extent of His power as God, but in the perfection of His sympathy with the tempted as Man, and thus did He become "a merciful as well as a faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God." In fact, that He might be the Good Physician to His sorrowing people, He came down and walked the wards of the great hospital of earth, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, "Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses."

3. But, again, the temptation was needed as being part of that great work which He came to accomplish on earth to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. We are in the habit, indeed, of thinking that the great work of atonement was all made on the Cross. I believe this to be an error; the great work was indeed finished upon the Cross when He exclaimed, "It is finished, and bowed His head and gave up the ghost;" but His suffering all through life, from the manger in Bethlehem to the Cross of Calvary, were part and parcel of the great work of man's redemption. When wounded and bruised, betrayed and forsaken, alike in the wilderness as in the garden of Gethsemane, when "His sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground," He was going through that baptism of fire that He was straightened to accomplish on the Cross; hence, as the first Adam was overcome by Satan in the garden of Eden, he was met and overcome in the wilderness by the second Adam as our Head and Surety when "of the people there was none with Him."

But, once more, the temptation was needed for His people's sake, that they might be encouraged to come with boldness to the throne of grace and thus find mercy and grace to help in the time of their need. We can quite understand that if, in the hour of trial and sorrow, we were bidden to draw near to God, to that God "Who is a Spirit, and of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," we should, like Moses, exceedingly fear and quake; but when we are invited to come to God through Him Who was "the Man of sorrows and acquainted

with grief, Who suffered, being tempted," then, indeed, the sympathy of Christ awakes within the heart of the Christian a feeling of confiding trust that encourages him to come with holy boldness to the throne of grace, and pour into the listening ear of the merciful High Priest the tale of his sorrows and woes. But, more than this, we have in the person of Christ not only an encouragement to come to Him, but an example as to the manner in which we should meet the temptations of Satan. In the beginning of the Old Testament we have a warning set before us in the person of Adam, who was overcome by the wicked one, and, had we looked only to this, we might not have had courage "to resist the devil;" but when from the Old we turn to the first pages of the New Testament, we have a blessed and encouraging example set before us in the person of our Redeemer as to the manner in which He met and overcame strong temptations of Satan, and He has left us an encouraging example to "resist the devil," assured that "in due time he will flee from us."

And now, on a review of the whole subject before us, who does not feel what a terrible thing is sin, and what a deep mystery hangs over the being and action of the devil? That the eternal Son of God should leave the glory which he had with the Father, should come down to earth and tabernacle among us in human flesh, that he should wade through scenes of sorrow and suffering, should so meet the strong temptations of the devil in the wilderness, that in the agony of his soul he should give expression to his sorrows in strong crying and tears, all to atone for sin and destroy the works of the devil, is there not in all this a marvellous insight into the terrible nature, sin, and the mystery of iniquity wrought by the devil? And yet sin still prevails, and Satan walks up and down the world. Why all this is permitted are questions which we cannot fully answer now; but we shall know hereafter. Meanwhile God's purposes, though slow, are sure. With Him "a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years." He is not "slack concerning His promise, but is long-suffering." There is mercy in this mystery, believe it, my brethren; trust God where you cannot trace Him. The mystery of God's purposes shall yet be unveiled before men and angels. The Son of God shall destroy the works of the devil. The wilderness shall blossom as the rose, and not a blot of sin shall be left with its withering influence to mar the fair creation of God, now groaning and travelling in pain. Paradise shall be more than restored, and everything that God has made shall be "very good." This shall be when the "mighty angel, who has the key of the bottomless pit, shall lay hold on the dragon, and the devil that deceived the nations shall be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

Meanwhile you are passing through the wilderness of this world, and the devil is there to tempt you as he tempted your Master of old, and the fiery scorpions are there to bite you, as the children of Israel were bitten of old; but be of good cheer, the devil is already chained. Jesus is there, "the stronger than he," and the Spirit of God is there. Seek to be led by the Spirit, keep close to Jesus, and then you are safe; you may be sore tempted, but not destroyed. "The messenger of Satan" may be permitted to buffet you, that you may be kept lowly and made perfect through suffering, but your thrice-repeated prayer will bring the answer: "My grace is sufficient for you." Then with Paul you may say, "Most gladly, therefore, will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me," and look forward in the anticipations of happy hope to that glorious time when the whole creation, which is groaning and travelling in pain together until now, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

THE NOBILITY OF MAN.

By the Rev. T. SELBY HENREY, Curate of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, in the City of London.

Four Lectures Preached in the Parish Church of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, on the Sunday Evenings of January 26th, February 2nd, 9th, 16th, 1890.

Lecture III.

"What is Man? . . . . . For thou hast made him but little lower than God."—Psalm viii. 4 (R.V.).

THE idea of the development of character, the ego of man, is plainly enunciated in Scripture. St. Paul writing to the Philippians speaks of "this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." And the same apostle reminds the Ephesians of the time when they should arrive at a "perfect manhood."

1. We will now turn to the periodical ordeals of life, considering that of pain first. One of the many explanations that can be given for the existence of pain may be found in a modern discovery, namely, in the manufactory of water-gas, which, being odourless, a disagreeable pungent volatile is generated with it to cause any escape that might occur to be noticeable, and thus prevent explosion. So even from a physical standpoint is not pain a blessing, if only to direct man to the knowledge and seat of his malady.

But suffering has a higher ministry to discharge; it is a boon in disguise to point the spirit of man to the Man of Sorrows, Whose

example was so reflected in the character of Frederick the Noble, who shortly before he ex changed the earthly cross and crown for the heavenly diadem, wrote on a slip of paper, handing it to the future Kaiser, "Learn how to suffer without complaining." Truly an echo of those words on Calvary's Cross! Pain can only be analysed by the light of the Cross of Christ, and by the same means the only power to endure it heroically can be found. However acute physical pain may be there is something far more poignant—I allude to mental pain. And care must be taken not to eliminate the real from the anticipated sorrows of life. Lord Beaconsfield once said that three-fourths of the sorrows of life were imaginary based in the future, and when that future transfers itself into the present they are found never to have had any substantial existence. The Christian must ever bear in mind that imaginary sorrows will even be more severe than real ones, because Christ's promises refer to the real: "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." Here is inspiration that you are never left alone, but amidst the fiercest ordeals the Divine presence accompanies you—in short, here lies the Christian's guarantee of victory.

2. One phase of sorrow quickly presents another, and it may not be irrelevant now to touch on the bereavements of life. We will take two instances recorded in the gospel story. What distressing sorrow has been transformed into spiritual joy and gladness on many a humble believer after reading the account of the house of mourning at Bethany, where "Jesus wept" not only for Mary and Martha, but to give an eternal guarantee that He will visit and weep with any of His brethren, teaching them at the same time not "to weep" as men without hope, for them that sleep in Him, "for I am the Resurrection and the Life." It is natural to men to mourn; but we are more than men, *we* are Christians, and Christians are expressly warned 'not to sorrow for them which sleep in Jesus, *even as others which have no hope.*'"

Again, consider how our Lord came to this earth of ours, collecting around Him a band of humble men, and sowed the little seed of the Christian Church in this cold world, and humanly speaking at the very time the apostles wanted their Divine Master the most. He is taken away from them by cruel death. The humble men now to be left alone to be persecuted by those fanatical high priests; scoffed at by those sceptical Sadducees; opposed by those hypocritical Pharisees; and hated and run to earth by an angry mob. Must the disciples not have considered that the ends for which Christ came to achieve must have been killed, ah, buried with Him? How very like ourselves. Have we never thought that a certain death would have crushed us, that our future would have become a hideous blank, a revolting nullity? Speaking after the manner of men nothing could have happened more disastrous to the infant church. Yet we see the power of that divine law. Divine strength, emanating from human weakness, so that the glory may not be of man, but of God. From the apparent failure of Christ's mission we trace the Church's growth from twelve to one hundred and twenty, then three thousand, then five thousand; how those timid fishermen waxed valiant in the faith; how they and their successors for several centuries after not only worked, but died for the cause of the crucified, Risen, but now ascended Saviour. So age by age the Church has developed, wielding the greatest power this world has ever seen, making votaries of emperors and kings, until to-day almost in every part of the globe missionaries are ploughing up dark heathendom, absorbing all false religions, and planting the standard of our salvation, henceforth designated Christendom. Let us learn from God's method as seen in the Church purchased by the death of His dear Son, and discipline our spirits to breath forth, "My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness."

3. And when we reflect on a kindred subject to that of bereavement how wonderfully does nature afford an illustration to float and carry the great argosies of the imagination. Who has not admired the fleeting moments of an expiring day, as darkness silently but surely intensifies, and line after line of woodland, broken by hollow or dell, becomes filled with vaporous wreaths of mist, the old gnarled trees casting their weird forms athwart the grass, the air becoming resonant with nocturnal voices, and then the mountain ridges melting into a dim rugged outline, from whose background there is seen to soar the evening star sailing in solitary dignity, gilding the contour of the mountains—alone. Now lost amidst fleeting clouds that sweep across the sky, then in its solemn lonelines scaling high above the world. We watch, and as the gloom deepens its solitude is dispelled, for it is cheered as there break from their places of ambush celestial hosts to keep it company throughout the midnight hours. It is a sight provocative of deep reflection. For is it not the lot of man to rise aloft, and like Hesperus in solitude to fight some mental struggle alone with no other visitants but the ghostly shadows created by the scudding clouds of earth, and he offers up his vesper hymn:—

> "Abide with me: fast falls the eventide:
> The darkness deepens, Lord, with me abide."

There may be companionships veiled from mortal ken until a higher light steps in to enable us to see as Elisha's servant did; the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire. And the young man's encouragement may be ours: "Fear not, for they that be with us are more than they that be with them."

It was the Son of Man's wont to retire at even-

tide, making the hoary hills the altars at which He offered His prayers to His Father; and, O man, as thou standest apparently alone upon thy spiritual height of overwhelming sorrow, Christ's ejaculation will be echoed, "Yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me." There will break forth the silvery moon to bear thee company and seem to say, "Ah, if thou art forgotten on earth, I am the representative of those in heaven, and though forgotten on earth, yet thou art being remembered in heaven."

4. We arrive now at a stage when we must consider this momentous event, namely, when the body is to return to mother earth, and the spirit return to God who first gave it from a personal standpoint. The Bishop of Peterborough once said in St. Paul's Cathedral "that there is, at least, one hour in the life of every man in which he finds himself absolutely helpless and poor, and that is at the last. Rich you may live, but you must die paupers."

Though death is the penalty and the punishment for all who have sinned, still much of its sting is destroyed by Christ's resurrection. By throwing aside the drapery with which Dante in the 14th century shrouded the subject by so materialising the nether regions, intensified as it was by the hideous and unhealthy gloom with which the Puritans of the 16th century crystallised death, there is the sense in which the Christian can reiterate those culminating words of St. Paul: "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." And his range of vision brightened by the following words, lately extracted from a daily paper: "With the consequent immeasurable gain of a deeper recognition of the truth that man is not a body endowed with an immortal soul, but rather a spiritual being who has a body and can never die." These are words from the pen of the Duke of Westminster.

The key-note for the solution of the problem is to be found in the belief that man is best prepared for dying when he is best fitted for living, and one will find that by dealing with life, as aforesaid laid down in the cultivation of character, is as needful for living happily as for dying composedly, so to be prepared for death is to be ready in the noblest sense to live.

But cannot it be conceded as an axiom that the inmost aspiration of mankind is similar to that of Balaam of old: "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his," and too like to the prophet's wish to have the end without the desire to take up the cross under which leverage the crown can alone be secured, who crave to die well without the ambition for living well. A lady once asked John Wesley, "Supposing that you knew, Mr. Wesley, you were to die at twelve o'clock to morrow night, how would you spend the intervening time?" "How, madam?" he replied. "Why just as I intend to spend it now. I should preach at——, converse with my family, retire to my room at ten o'clock, commend myself to my Heavenly Father, lie down to rest, and wake up in glory." And what says the noble-minded Charles Kingsley as he was on the point of leaving this world. Listen: "Twenty years ago, and often since, I have expressed a desire for this moment—God forgive me if I am wrong—but I have looked forward to this with an intense and reverent curiosity." And is not the idea of man's educating himself for this great event divinely expressed in the lines of the well-known hymn:—

> "Teach me to live, that I may dread
> The grave as little as my bed."

What a sweet fancy was that of the Portuguese navigator who, after having rounded Cape Horn amidst storm and terror, found that the ocean on which he had entered lay, as if hushed asleep before him, ascribing its calm to the glittering southern cross reflected upon its waters. O grant that this experience may be ours when we have turned our backs on the troubled ocean of this life and are "passing through the waters" of death!

> "Why will ye call it death's dark night?
> Death is the passage into light;
> Behind its gloomy purple gates
> The everlasting morning waits.
>
> "Then fear not death, its pains, its strife,
> Its troubles—these belong to life.
> Death is the moment when they cease,
> When Christ says come, and all is peace.'

Nature has ordained that all life should achieve its end by adverse circumstances, as it ordains the fish to swim against the stream, the migratory birds to fly in a contrary direction to the winds, also placing man in his area of conflict with this distinction, that the former shall be guided by instinct, while the latter, on account of his superiority, by conscience. If man therefore finds himself in a labyrinth of trouble, he will also discover a divine golden cord by which he may disentangle himself, as the beneficent dock-leaf grows alongside the stinging-nettle, so the balm of Gilead will be found within reach ready to assuage all earth's smartings. It is through much tribulation that ye shall enter into the kingdom of God. Tribulation originally used in connection with threshing, which separated the corn from the husks, was appropriated by the early Christian Church to the sorrows and trials, "tribulations, threshings; that is, of the inner spiritual man, without which there could be no fitting him for the heavenly garner" (Archbishop Trench). And did not tribulation faithfully discharge its duties in the case of Joseph, Moses, Job, Daniel, Stephen, and only time fails to enumerate the galaxy formed by such names. Each became a hero in life's moral and spiritual campaign, each became superior to the conditions of the world around. Yet ere the crucial test by careful reading we glean that there had been a great inward work going on under the rectorship of God's Holy Spirit—the noble architecture of self-building. But it cannot be too often

remembered that character-building without the Divine Architect will be like that day of youth when on the sea-shore we, concentrating our energies on some sand-castle, taxing our strength to the utmost by carrying great boulder stones to the scene of action, filling up the crevices with sand which we packed and patted with our little spades to consolidate the whole. What youthful ideas of engineering we displayed on it! How we congratulated ourselves on its strength, it will indeed defy the waves! We watched, and lo, to our dismay, the waves of the incoming tide came, and contrary to sanguine expectation our castle crumbled at our feet—exploding all our hopes. How like children of an older growth? "Without me," says the Divine Pattern, "ye can do nothing."

As little grains of sand went to make our castle, so little things cause great results in the outer world, and small actions and words go to consolidate a habit, and the accumulation of habits go to shape the character. We are told that a friend once called on Michael Angelo who was finishing a statue. Some time after he called again. Angelo was still at the same statue. The friend, beholding the figure, exclaimed. "You have been idle since I last saw you." "Not at all," replied the great sculptor, "I have retouched this vein: I have given more expression to the lips, language to the eyes." "Well, well," said his friend, "but these are all trifles." "It may be so," replied Angelo; "but I recollect that trifles make perfection, and that perfection is no trifle."

Man is the iron and God is the smith; and we are always in the forge or on the anvil—God is shaping us for higher things. "The world's greatest teachers have usually been men of sorrow" states a professor of logic. "I do not mean whining, sickly, sentimental sorrow like that of Byron, or Alfred de Musset, or Heine. The sorrow which a man feels because he cannot satisfy his greedy thirst for pleasure is not at all ennobling. But for sorrow, manly and heroic, we may well thank God." When Dumas asked Reboul, "What made you a poet?" the answer was, "Suffering." "If I had not been so great an invalid," said Darwin to a friend, "I should not have done nearly so much work." "We will not complain," says Thomas Carlyle, "of Dante's miseries; had all gone right with him, as he wished it, Florence would have had another prosperous lord mayor, but the world would have lost the 'Divine Commedia.' We do not know much about Shakespeare's life; but we do know from his sonnets that he had suffered vastly. His heart had been wrong till it almost broke. And in Tennyson we had another striking illustration of the educative effects of suffering. 'In Memoriam' is by far his greatest poem; there are single stanzas in it worth almost all the rest of his works put together, and this poem was inspired by a great grief, by the death, namely, of his friend Arthur Hallam. Nor is it only those who will have a niche in the Temple of Fame that are teachers of sorrow's divine lessons. I have known others of whom the world will never hear." O Christian, thy little world may be full of tortuous windings, bristling with difficulties—a path sentinelled with spiritual foes, some in the open, but many lying in ambush; "the night is dark, and thou art far from home." But thy star of hope lies in the promise that "whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. He who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Jesus Christ, after ye have suffered awhile, shall transform you in a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ"—"the Man of Sorrows, and acquainted with grief, Who was made perfect in suffering."

Now to gather up the thoughts advanced in this lecture. Though undoubtedly much can, and is, learnt from the successes and failures of fellow-men, man must be careful not to allow himself to transform into a mere copyist. A classic once designed to make the most exquisite picture that could be imagined, adopting the eye of Chione, the hair of Paegnium, the Tarsia's lip, Philenium's chin, and the forehead of Delphia, and setting all these upon Milphidippa's neck, thought that he should outdo both art and nature. Hardly necessary to say that what was becoming in one did not agree with the excellency of the other, thus his ideal was shattered.

The words of Sir Joshua Reynolds may be helpful at this juncture. "The genius," he says, "of a true sculptor is a gift of heaven, an inspiration from above. As described by the ancients, he is supposed to have ascended to the *celestial region*, and to have imbued his mind with a perfect iead of beauty. An ancient sculpor like Phidias, when he would represent a Zeus or an Athéné, did not set before him any human pattern, but having a more perfect idea of majesty and beauty in his own mind, he steadily contemplated this, and earnestly endeavoured to represent it." Let us apply such language to our own character-building, the example of man must be quite secondary to the example of Christ.

Again, the cultivation of any one quality at the exclusion of others must be a suicidal policy. Character can only be on the royal road to perfection when all the functions have their full and legitimate exercise. As all the chords of a well-tuned instrument contribute to the music it is designed to produce. No chord must be untouched, each must resound their own vibrations to cause harmony perfect.

During the formation of character man must be careful in his criticism, for the charm of a work of art is often only appreciated by a distant view, too close an inspection often having a prejudicial or blinding effect. Or liken the present weaving of character to a piece of needlework, if we look on the wrong side we see all the skeins and ends in a

state of entanglement; if we could but only wait its completion to see the other side we should see a perfect pattern. Now we only see the reverse side. Thread by thread we weave the warp and woof of character, and if we only do our duty day by day we shall discover a pattern more beautiful than we could have designed ourselves.

If a succession of thoughts and deeds have been drilled to transform the raw recruit, as have been enunciated, habits will necessarily have been erected, and almost without man's cognizance a character will have been delineated and coalesced which will be the helm in the hands of the Divine Navigator. The inebriate, by a series of intemperate acts, which on the onset he can regulate or resist, forms at length a habit which makes him completely its servant. So a character, chivalrously and divinely built up, will take possession of the man, and control him, giving him ballast to encounter every emergency. The following beautiful words will not be irrelevant at this stage. "The highest gladness is reached by man when his will is lovingly merged in the holy and righteous and loving will of God; when without effort the spirit responds joyously and naturally to the promptings of the Holy Spirit of all life; when the "I" is not "I," but the "I" which has most truly found itself in the life of another; when the "I" is not "I," but the Christ within (Gal. ii. 20), yet not within only, but both without and within, making harmony between man and his environment, between desire and duty, between the self and the higher than self. For such a man "all things work together for good." Man will thus hold the patents of true nobility, and standing erect, all things animate and inanimate will retire to form a background, and subserviently point to man as in bygone days all roads pointed to Rome. And while the undisciplined beholds his dying as a time of intellectual weakness, and warns his brothers that he is to be judged by the days of strength, and not by the days of physical collapse, the torch of Christian character will burn more brightly, for he will be enabled to say Christianity is not only a saving truth but a saving power, for "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me," therefore "I faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." And this is the climax of the true nobility of man here on earth.

Brother, on the common voyage of life may it be that from to-day that wave of character be allowed to accumulate and form, and under the guide of the Ruler of earth and sea it will go on gathering from the troubled seas of this life; and in futurity it shall roll over the shore of earth, and stand for a season in equipose, and curl and then fall with such a storm of sweet music, as the one who "overcometh shall inherit all things" in that country "where there shall be no more sea"—the type of turmoil and change.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1890.

CHURCHMEN IN COUNCIL.

THIS Society, which has assumed the above title, has been gradually developing into its present condition of activity, a condition which even to its opponents must appear to be no mean one. In tracing the history of our Church's progress during the last generation we come back to a period which presents to us a spirit of awakening energy among the younger ecclesiastics of the period. The movement which has been gradually progressing in vitality and public influence has culminated in the rise of a party in the Church which, whilst of an advanced nature, had begun to show its power about ten years ago. Even the more energetic Churchman of evangelical creed had up to this time hardly deigned to recognise this party as one of any real importance, but were finally brought face to face with the fact that something must be done to stem the power of this insidious movement, which threatened to shake the very foundation of our Protestant Evangelical Church. But whilst the difficulties and dangers remained, none were found to be willing and capable of entering the lists on behalf of the old Church Party. Men began to say that prominent evangelical leaders ought to take active steps. Thus did matters remain in *statu quo* until a new phase of religious belief, which had been for some time seeking to reach daylight, made itself felt. The Ultra-Broad views, coming as they did soon after the maturity of the advanced "Catholic" School, proved the final crash which awoke men of all shades of religious belief to the fact that the ancient Church of England was in imminent peril. All who chose to think and observe at all became

painfully conscious that the Anglican communion was being only too surely torn in three separate and widely divergent directions, and that instead of fighting the numerous external enemies, the Church would ere long be engaged in terrible and destructive internal conflict. That something ought to be done all felt, but what? and on this point the silence remained as complete as ever.

Quite recently leading men of the various schools of religious thought seem, however, to have found a remedy which they believe will be efficacious in re-consolidating the Established Church into its quondam unity. These men met together and deliberated on the subject, and assumed the title of "Churchmen in Council." They recognised the principle of "give and take," and sought rather to discover the points of agreement than to discuss the questions on which they differed, with what result will be seen. It may be that their moral influence on their friends and followers will be great enough to make an appreciative difference in the religious feeling of the land, but we do not believe that they will ever effect any really important restrictive legislation in reference to the Church; and whilst we admire the spirit in which this has been undertaken, we are obliged to acknowledge that we do not think that they will ever succeed in bringing about any really good reform which shall at once meet with the approval of all three Church Parties.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—Your readers will, no doubt, appreciate any additional light "F. T. P." may be able to shed on the subject, as the result of his elaborate and certainly not too hasty researches; meanwhile, I hope to keep the even tenor of my way, and when I have dealt with the whole case (and when, I may add, your correspondent has perused my first letter) he will be better able to judge whether there is any lack of materials for the entire refutation of Dr. Hobart. Any information as to the use of the word *ἀνωτέρικος*, now the sole survivor of Dr. Hobart's gallant band of over 400 medical words, will doubtless be of interest.

"F. T. P." says: "I can imagine that Dr. Hobart would candidly acknowledge St. Luke's acquaintance with the LXX., and even the moulding of his phraseology in some measure upon it." Unfortunately the question is not one of imagination, but of fact, and what Dr. Hobart actually *does* say (page xxxiv.) in one most instructive example is: "The medical style of St. Luke accounts for the very frequent use made by him of . . . . . *προστίθεναι*, whereas Winer (who "has never been superseded," *Simcox*, "Language of New Testament," p. vii.) distinctly states that the use of the word in two of the passages quoted by Dr. Hobart (Luke xx., Acts xii.) is "a *pure* Hebraism," and is "opposed to the spirit of the Greek language." It is quite obvious that the medical writers were not wont to use "*pure* Hebraisms, opposed to the spirit of the Greek language," inasmuch as such expressions were the exclusive property of the isolated and too often bigoted Jew. *Ergo*, Dr. Hobart has fallen into error, and is wholly mistaken. So, too, Dr. Hobart is clearly quite wrong when, although he notes that *σκληροτράχηλος* is "used by the LXX., he goes on to say that St. Luke "was accustomed to the use of it in his medical practice; whereas Winer, as I have already mentioned, truly says that it was a word "coined by the Greek-speaking Jews, or by the New Testament writers themselves," the context, moreover, plainly showing that the whole phraseology of the passage was derived from the Septuagint and from no other source. Dr. Hobart in this case deliberately rejected the LXX. that he might keep to the medical writers, and, as I have observed, he is clearly in error. When "F. T. P." observes that "the LXX. and Hebraising phraseology found in the writings of St. Luke appear to indicate nothing more than the influence of his studies in the Jewish Scriptures, and of the materials he moulded into his works," I can only wonder if "F. T. P." is acquainted with Grenfield, and if he has ever made more than a superficial literary examination of the works referred to. There is superabundant evidence on every page that the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts was a Jew, and the Jew, like the poet *nascitur non fit*, he *can't* by any possibility *be manufactured*. The writer of the Third Gospel was a *born* Jew and nothing else, as I hope to demonstrate in a future letter.

Further, "F. T. P." observes, and most truly, that "it is open to Dr. Hobart to suggest that mere vocabulary enumeration does not refute his position." There is the meaning to be considered as well as the word itself; *e.g.*, Luke viii. 44, we find *ἱστάναι* in the sense of "to stanch," Acts xiv. 8, *ἀδύνατος* in the sense of "impotent." Quite so, "there is the meaning to be considered as well as the word itself." Let us then take *συστέλλειν*, as to which Dr. Hobart (p. 37) says: "In medical language the word is very frequent, and its use varied." But in spite of the frequency of the word, and the variety of its use by the doctors, Dr. Hobart *cannot bring forward one single instance* in which *συστέλλειν* is used in *precisely* the same meaning as it has in Acts v. As to *ἱστάναι* we have not to search beyond the opening chapters of the second book of the Septuagint before we find the phrase *ἔστη τὸ αἷμα*, "the flow of blood was stanched" (Exod. iv. 25, 26.) Digressing for a moment, Dr. Hobart's next example on the same page (p. 15) is *ῥύσις αἵματος*, as to which he remarks, "it is quite medical." Perhaps so, but it is also quite Hellenistic and quite Septuagintal, for *ῥύσις αἵματος* occurs in the LXX., in Leviticus xx. 18. With regard to *ἀδύνατος* the word has both an active meaning—*unable* to do something, *powerless*—and also a passive meaning—*that cannot be done*, *impossible*. It occurs in Acts xiv. 8 in this active sense "powerless." It bears just the same meaning (though used by way of metaphor) in Romans xv. 1 and Joel iii. 10; while the very phrase, *ἀδύνατος ποσί*, is used by Philo—another striking instance of *Jewish* rather than *medical* connection.

"F. T. P." goes on to say, "From page 55 to 85 Dr. Hobart compares in parallel passages the words employed by St. Luke and found in medical writings with those of Matthew and Mark, and presumably not so found."

Very well. Let us take an example. Dr. Hobart,

comparing (p. 66) the parallel passages of the synoptists, Matthew xiv. 3, Mark vi. 17, Luke iii. 20, says: "St. Luke here uses a very different word, κατακλείειν, from the other Evangelists, and one which . . . . was much employed by the medical writers. It is used by him alone, and is met with again in Acts xxvi. 10 in a similar connection" (*i.e.*, with the word φυλακή.) No doubt; but did not Dr. Hobart observe that the very phrase κατακλείειν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ led only to Jeremiah's dungeon (Jer. xxxix. 2, 3)—a fitting limbo for the fanciful and now exploded medical theory.

No *medical* argument can be founded on the *absence* of particular words, such as μαλακία, from the third Gospel, it being admitted on all sides that the author was a man of far more education and literary ability than either Matthew or Mark; but I can say at once in answer to his question, that τελεσφορέω and προβάλλω are by no means distinctive medical terms, the latter occurring at least *thrice* in the LXX., in Judges, Proverbs and Jeremiah, while τελεσφορέω is used not only by Strabo and Arrian (Epictetus), but also in his *antiquities* by Josephus, the *Jew*.

The truth is that Dr. Hobart begs the whole question, and *assumes the fundamental fact* which he is bound to prove, namely, whether there *really* was a technical medical language, "particularly conservative in its character," from Hippocrates to Galen (p. xxx.)—a period as long as that separating Lord Tennyson from Chaucer. It seems very improbable. Are not the different dialects and the growth and development of the Greek language somewhat against this view? What are we to say, too, about the different medical sects, who, according to Galen, were as obstinate in maintaining their opinions as the different sects of the philosophers. We hear of at least *three* such *medical sects* before Galen's time—the Dogmatic, the Empiric and the Methodic (Whewell, "Hist. Inductive Sciences"), and Galen, it must never be forgotten, was not even in his cradle when the Acts of the Apostles were written. No doubt Hippocrates, a voluminous writer, and the Father and Founder of Greek medicine, had some influence on the development of the Greek language, especially as he was one of the two standard authors in Ionic prose (*Matthiæ*); but then, as your correspondent hints, his works were not confined to the libraries of medical practitioners, but were in the hands of most educated men. We know that many of the medical words in Hippocrates occur in the Septuagint, and it is from the Septuagint, the natural vocabulary of the Greek-speaking Jew of the Apostolic age, that the author of the Third Gospel takes them, and not from Hippocrates, or from the special medical schools, as Dr. Hobart erroneously supposes.

H. HEBER EVANS.

February 25th, 1890.

SIR,—One is glad to have the opinion of so learned and able a man as Dr. Salmon on the above subject, endorsed too by Dr. Plummer. Archdeacon Farrar (Life of St. Paul, I. 480), upholds the same views. Some years ago Dean Plumptre (*Expositor* for August, 1876), wrote an ingenious paper on the same side of the question. It is possible that Prebendary Sadler in his two notices of "the medical language of St. Luke" in his "Church Commentary of the New Testament" is of the same opinion. I cannot speak for certain, as I have not seen his Commentary on St. Luke and the Book of Acts. There appears, however, to be a growing consensus of opinion in favour of a recognition of such medical language from the pen of St. Luke—at least among English divines.

But, in fairness to Mr. Heber Evans, and those who side with him, it must be remembered that the two works of St. Luke are saturated with LXX. phraseology and Hebraisms, particularly the Gospel and the first half of Acts. I say it without fear of contradiction from those who have made the Greek medical writers a study, that it is unquestionably easier to prove that St. Luke knew his LXX, and followed it than that he was familiar with the writings of Hippocrates and Dioscorides. To take one instance out of several, St. Luke frequently begins a paragraph with καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ, followed by the infinitive or by a noun, a phrase of familiar occurrence in the LXX. Will any of the learned men above give one single instance from the two medical writers I have named? I know I might throw in Aretæus, and I believe Galen as well, though I do not claim to have read more than a few of his folios yet.

Again the moral and spiritual tone of St. Luke's writings belongs to a different strata; he uses undoubtedly a number of words which are found in Greek medicals, but so do the other New Testament writers, although Dr. Hobart passes that by unnoticed; but the point of my observation is this, that a goodly list can be made out of words used by medical writers in one sense and by St. Luke in another sense, and that generally the sense of the other New Testament writers. This fact, which is undoubted, is to my mind of more importance than the mere use of some medical words, which may not have been technical, in the sense of exclusive, but really part of the κοινὴ διάλεκτος of all educated people.

Further, it is rather prejudicial to what I may call the English school of thought that all ancient commentators on the New Testament—men who lived near the period of the publication of St. Luke's writings, and who were best able to judge between the language of the professional and of the unprofessional, —have passed by unnoticed this *soi-disant* medical language of our author. Dr. Plummer will correct me if I am wrong on this point. Again the learned divine, Dr. F. Bleek, passes it by unnoticed in his observations on the character of New Testament Greek. More recently that acute critic and learned theologian, Dr. B. Weiss (Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, vol. II., page 312), in a note on St. Luke's Gospel, brushes the whole claim aside: "To profess to discover traces of medical knowledge is mere trifling."

Now, sir, where doctors differ, the patient is in a bad case. Unfortunately we have no treatise on Greek medical writers, but the special pleading one of Dr. Hobart, who, on the showing of Dr. Salmon, "pushes his argument too far." What we want is a calm, well-digested treatise, written after an exhaustive survey of the whole field, medical and literary, of the period, and enabling your readers and the public to arrive at a reasonable conclusion on the subject.

F. T. P.

March 4th, 1890.

PAUL OR JOHN?

SIR,—The 1st of March number of the PULPIT opens with a very excellent sermon by the Rev. B.

Maturin, in which, however, he refers to part of the 12th chapter of 2nd Corinthians, and gives to it a construction and interpretation which I consider wholly at variance with the text.

Paul was not a man to hide his light under a bushel; nor was he in the habit of concealing any event that befell him. We have but to read the Acts of the Apostles and his Epistles to satisfy ourselves on this head. If there was one Apostle who spoke more than another of his trials, afflictions, and triumphs, that man was Paul; and why he should conceal himself for no apparent reason in the reference he makes to a vision which somebody saw is puzzling to the ordinary reader.

But I would ask Mr. Maturin why does he assume that Paul refers to himself. The tenor of his language is against such a conclusion. If Paul had meant himself he would undoubtedly, judging by previous examples, have said so; but instead of this he says "he knew a man fourteen years ago who was taken up into the third heaven, and heard things unlawful to repeat," and he interjects, parenthetically, that he could not tell whether this man was taken up in the spirit or in the body. He says, "God knoweth," and he adds, he will glory in this man but not in himself, and so on. It is to my mind clear, therefore, that Paul refers not to himself, but to some one else; and to whom else can he refer but to John? He may have heard from John, or seen and spoken to him, fourteen years before he wrote that 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, and been informed by him of the revelation which had been made to him in heaven, and in which revelation things were uttered that John was explicitly warned against recording. Would Mr. Maturin kindly say upon what authority he makes Paul the subject of this vision. I know he is not alone in this view of the subject, but I should like to be informed upon what ground he and some others thus interpret this chapter. It is true Paul does not name John. I do not know why. It was clearly not considered necessary, else he would have done so. The time was a period of persecution. Probably he withheld the name for this reason. In any case the mention of John's name was not necessary; it was enough to state the fact.

JOHN A. WALKER.

Dublin.

THE LATE DR. LITTLEDALE.

SIR,—Your correspondent "B." has, I suppose, read "Words for Truth," as he criticises Canon Crosthwaite's remarks on it rather freely. No writer is infallible on any subject; and, therefore, in order to be just, especially *de mortuis*, allow me to quote the sentence which it seems almost impossible such a writer as the late Dr. Littledale could have written, when speaking of the practical abandonment of Transubstantiation by Roman theologians. His words are: "For whereas they formerly taught that only mere phantasms of bread and wine survive after consecration, now the received teaching is that no physical change whatever of which the senses can take cognisance is effected by consecration, but that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before. This is the Anglican doctrine, that 'they remain in their very natural substances,' expressed in other but equivalent language.

This statement of Rome's "former teaching" is certainly incorrect, and was contradicted during Dr. Littledale's lifetime by the Roman Catholic Press. Rome always taught that *all* the accidents of the bread and wine remain unchanged after consecration, though their substances were gone. No more need, then, be said to prove what Rome *did* teach. But Dr. Littledale says the received teaching *now* is different—no physical change, perceptible to the senses, is effected by consecration, but all the accidents remain as they were before. Had Dr. Littledale added, Although their substances were changed, he would be stating the true Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation: but instead, he goes on to state his definition of the Anglican doctrine in a manner which I leave to others to comment on.

This way of stating three different doctrines on the one subject may have led some (Canon Crosthwaite amongst the number) to suppose that Dr. Littledale thought "phantasms" and "accidents" identical terms; but whether he did so or not, his words, as I have quoted them *verbatim*, do not accurately define either Anglican or Roman doctrine.

INQUIRENS.

P.S.—The *Church Times* of February 1st, 1890, says plainly that Dr. Littledale used "phantasms" and "accidents" as convertible terms.

SIR,—I have acknowledged Dr. Littledale's services to the Church, and his cleverness in his "Petrine Claims" and his exposure of Mariolatry. But even Homer sometimes nodded. Perhaps such words as "childish twaddle" might have been spared. It is argument that does the work, and not hard words. Passing over all that is personal, I now state my case.

(1.) I know that "phantasms" ought not to be used for "accidents," as the latter include smell, taste and feel, as well as appearance. But Dr. Littledale uses them as equivalent. I will prove this. Romanists, he says, "formerly taught that only mere phantasms of Bread and Wine survive after Consecration." Now what they *did* teach is, that taste, smell, and feel, as well as appearances, remain; so that by "phantasms" he must have meant all the accidents, unless he would tell the world that Rome formerly taught that no smell, taste, or feel, of Bread remain after Consecration, which is absurd.

(2.) Dr. Littledale tells us that Rome has changed her doctrine. He gives the old doctrine and the new. But the priest showed in his review that Rome's doctrine has not changed.

(3.) Dr. Littledale handles the Black Rubric in the same manner as he does Roman doctrine. He tells us that what the Black Rubric says remain in their very natural substances are not the Bread and Wine, but their accidents. This is so plainly false that it requires no further mention.

(4.) It is of very little consequence when I first discovered that elevation is forbidden in Edward's 1st Book, or that *The Church Times* has cast that book aside, and fallen back on Romish Ornaments, &c., as left by Henry VIII. These things do not touch my argument.

(5.) If it was ignorant of me to say that Dr. Littledale identifies "phantasms" with "accidents," *The Church Times* has fallen into the same error. When asked the question, it said, on Feb. 1, "Clearly by 'phantasms' is meant 'accidents' . . . . If the substance were really gone, the visible accidents were

mere phantasms." By "visible" it evidently meant to include all "sensible" accidents that are detected by any of our senses, and not by sight alone. I would not have said a word to expose the faults of one who was learned and useful if the attempt had not been made to set him up as a representative man, though his faults are evident to both Romanists and Dissenters. Whomsoever one loves, he ought to love truly best.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

SIR,—Truth is eternal, fixed, absolute. "We can do nothing against the truth," says the Apostle, "but only for the truth." I fancy that the Apostle here intends that all our efforts—for this is all we can do—should be directed to persuade men to embrace "the truth as it is in Jesus." This being so, it forwards nothing to introduce personalities. Mr. Lawrence will, therefore, understand why I notice nothing in his letter but that which concerns the argument.

I find that I have to notice two things: (1.) His complete answers; and (2) His incomplete one.

(1.) Mr. Lawrence finds no difficulty in affirming that Universalists admit the universal depravity of the human race. His experience is not mine. I have had personal intercourse with some, and here I know they would hesitate. And of course it follows that they do not admit that there is no help in man. They find a great deal that is good in him. He says, too, that they hold "that salvation is all of sovereign grace most fully and absolutely." This is passing strange when they hold that there is nothing from which to be saved. There is no danger. Where can there be any salvation? Then he says that Universalists hold the doctrine of the submission of the human will to the Divine. And yet they exercise their own will in all things! They persist in saying there is no hell, when God says, "The wicked shall be turned into hell. . . .", And lastly, Mr. Lawrence has no hesitation in saying that the Atonement saves from hell, while at the same time he affirms there is none from which to be saved. Why, it was only the other day, in company with several Universalists, I heard the idea ridiculed as a myth.

(2.) He is unable to give an answer to my question: Does the Universalist believe that the exercise of faith in the Atonement is accompanied with a holy life, showing itself in works of charity to men and devotion to God, and in which there is a foretaste of the joys of heaven? He says that if they believe this they believe what is contrary to fact. Now I shall observe, first, that this is the crucial test; and second, inability to give an answer upsets *in toto* the Universalist's dream. My propositions whereby I show this—and briefly, to save time and space—are: (1.) Faith in the Atonement leads to a holy life. "The just shall live by faith." (2.) The life of faith is a life of love to man and God. (3.) The life of faith is a life wherein there is a foretaste of the joys of heaven. 'I know," says the Apostle; "hath," says the Saviour.

May I ask Mr. Lawrence if he thinks, when I have taken my ticket at the booking-office and my seat in the train, that I do not know where I am going? And if he says: "Oh, but I do not know that I am going to heaven," then I must answer that he has not started with faith in the means.

And may I ask "J. B." how he makes it out that there are any elect if he asserts that all are saved?

I thought our friends would have escaped the pitfall. They are not so wary as many of their compeers, who assert "that men are pretty much alike." This dictum is necessary to Universalism. To admit that God saves some before death and others after is to affirm that God governs the world on two contrary principles—a gross and palpable absurdity. But why do our friends fight so shy of this point?

I shall be able to show by-and-bye, when there is time and space, that Col. i. cannot bear the interpretation that "J. B." seeks to impose upon it without violent contradiction.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, March 1st, 1890.

(This discussion is now closed.—ED.)

WHAT IS REALLY LEGAL, AND WHAT ALLOWED BY USE?

SIR,—This is an interesting question which may be discussed without any reference to the case now *sub judice*.

The *Church Times* says that all that Henry VIII. left is now legal, because it was so in the second year of Edward VI. up to the seven last days of that year. "The seven days," it says, "were too short to set aside what they declared to be illegal." This is one argument for Roman Ornaments, etc. But there is another. Many are the things allowed as not illegal, though not sanctioned because they have always been in use. Pulpits, for instance, and organs and hymns, and the manual acts, which, though enacted by Edward's 1st Book, are not mentioned in either his 2nd Book or Elizabeth's—not, in fact, till 1662.

Now this argument of constant use is very important, but it cannot be pressed as a sanction for what was done in Henry VIII.'s time, but given up universally till now revived.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

IT is stated in the daily press that news has been received from the Bishop of Truro, who has been travelling in Egypt for the benefit of his health, that he intends returning to his diocese in April, when he will determine the question whether he will retire from the bishopric or recommence its duties. His lordship has been absent from this country nearly twelve months. In consequence of Canon Scott Holland's absence with the Bishop, his residence at St. Paul's this year will be in the months of May, July, and September.

THE Rev. Caleb Lord. of Wolverhampton, has left the Wesleyan body, and is to be ordained by the Bishop of Ripon. Mr. Lord, who is said to be a very able preacher, was educated at the Didsbury Theological Institution. The *Methodist Times* says :— "Mr. Lord's ministry had been highly appreciated in the Midlands, and also in such circuits as Colwyn Bay and Park-street, Bolton, which spheres of labour he filled previously. But, from communications we have received, there appears to be considerable soreness in Wolverhampton in consequence of the fact that although he conducted a service and a love-feast on Sunday evening, February 16th, in the Newhampton Road Chapel, and presided at a trustees' meeting on the following evening, he made no reference to his intended resignation, and left the town the day after the stewards were informed of the change in his views."

THE election of Mr. Llewelyn Davies to the Hulsean Lectureship, at Cambridge, is such a good appointment that if it had taken place according to the usual routine there must have been general satisfaction with the action of the electors. Unfortunately the election was not conducted according to the usual routine. On the 28th of January the Vice-Chancellor announced that the election would take place on the 13th of February, and invited the names of candidates. It is generally said that there was no lack of competent candidates—men whose erudition or reputation would compare favourably with that of any of the lecturers of recent years ; but there was no election on that day. Subsequently Mr. Llewelyn Davies, who had not been a candidate, was invited to stand, and he was elected on the 20th, exactly a week after the date originally fixed by the Vice-Chancellor The electors have thus put a slight upon all the candidates by treating them as men who were not competent to discharge the duties of the post for which they were applying. They have also changed the usual mode of appointment, for instead of selecting one of the candidates who offered himself, they have conferred the post upon a nominee of their own.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Benwell, Rev. H., M.A., Rector of Langton-by-Horncastle ; Vicar of Woodhall Spa, Lincoln.
Boggis, Rev. Robert James Edmund, M.A., Assistant-Curate of Wolborough-with-Newton Abbot, Devon ; Senior Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Exeter.
Briggs, Rev. Cornelius, Vicar of St. Thomas's, Bradford.
Brown, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Milton Malzor ; Rural Dean of Preston First Deanery.
Burges, Rev. John Hart, D.D., Rector of Devizes ; Chaplain of the Wilts County Asylum.
Burroughs, Rev. W. G., B.A., Chaplain Bengal (Rangoon).
Carter, Rev. J. Holderness, Curate of Cattistock, Dorset ; Priest-Vicar and Precentor of Grahamstown Cathedral, S. Africa.
Collin, Rev. E. W., M.A., Precentor in Christ Church Cathedral, Oxford.
Dalton, Rev. H. A., M.A., Assistant-Master of Winchester College ; Head Master of Felsted School.
Danvers, Rev. George Giberne, Vicar of Falkenham, Ipswich ; Rural Dean of Colneis.
Day, Rev. Arthur Benjamin, M.A., Vicar of Fishponds, Bristol ; Rector of Beercrocombe, Somersetshire.
Eccleston, Rev. J. B., M.A., Vicar of Brize-Norton, Oxon ; Warden of Holy Trinity Hospital, Clun, Shropshire.
Fishbourne, Rev. Edward Alexander, M.A., Rector of Llandyssil ; Rector of Newtown, Montgomery.
Foulkes, Rev. Thomas Henry, M.A., Chaplain of the Forces of the Fourth Class.
Hasluck, Rev. E. E., M.A., Minister of St. Chrysostom's, Birmingham ; Chaplain of the Winson-green Lunatic Asylum.
Hill, Rev. Edward Frank, M.A., Vicar of Shrivenham, Berks.
Hook, Rev. Walter, M.A., Rector of Porlock ; Rural Dean of Dunster.
Jones, Rev. Bulkeley Owen, M.A., Warden of Ruthin ; Rector of Llandyrnog, Denbigh.
Little, Rev. J. R., M.A., Senior Assistant-Master Tonbridge School ; Rector of Stansfield, Suffolk.
Love, Rev. Reginald Taverner, M.A., Vicar of Cowlinge, near Newmarket ; Rector of Purleigh, Essex.
Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. Edward, M.A., Assistant-Master at Eton College ; Head Master of Haileybury College.
Merewether, Rev. E. B., Curate of Bishopstone ; Acting Chaplain at Spezia.
Morgan, Rev. John Pary, M.A., Vicar of Llanrhaiadr-yn-Cinmerch ; Rector of Llandyssul, Montgomery.
Morris, Rev. Samuel S. O., M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Victoria*.
Perry, Rev. W. C., M.A., late Head Master of Queen Elizabeth's School, Dedham ; Second Master of King Edward's School, (Five Ways), Birmingham.
Rees, Rev. W. Ll., Curate of St. David's, Carmarthen ; Vicar of Llangunnock, Carmarthen.
Rogers, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Rector of Chickney, Essex.
Skrine, Rev. H. H., Curate of Newbury ; Vicar of Greenham, Newbury.
Staffurth, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Vicar of Frieston ; Prebendary of Centum Solidorum in Lincoln Cathedral.
Stowell, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Christ Church, Salford ; Rector of St. Lawrence's, Chorley.
Symns, Rev. John Edward, M.A., Chaplain of Bancroft's School, Woodford Wells.
Tatham, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A., Vicar of Wing ; Rector of Grove, Bucks.
Taylor, Rev. Henry Edward, Chaplain Fishermen's Church, Hastings ; Vicar of Great Wollaston, Shropshire.
Vaughan, Rev. John, M.A., Curate of Alton ; Vicar of Portchester, Hants.
Vickers, Rev. N., B.A., Vicar of St. John's, King's Lynn ; Vicar of "Charles," Plymouth.
Williams, Rev. David, Rector of Llandyrnog ; Warden of Ruthen.
Williams, Rev. John, Rector of Newtown ; Vicar of Llanrhaiadr-yn-Cinmerch.
Williams, Rev. M. P., M.A., Rector of Rotherfield Peppard, Henley, Oxon.
Wolseley, Rev. R. W., B.A., Vicar of Cautley-with-Dowbiggin, Yorkshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bennett, Rev. George Bright, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's and Rector of St. Owen's, Hereford, at the Vicarage, on the 25th ult., aged 59.
Carter, Rev. George, late Rector of Compton Beauchamp, Berks, at the Ferns, Torquay, on the 2nd inst., aged 77.
Gape, Rev. Charles, M.A., for many years Vicar of Sibsey and Willoughton, Lincolnshire, at 11, Exeter Road, Brondesbury, on the 24th ult., aged 91.
Meyrick, Rev. Maurice, Vicar of Northmoor, at Northmoor, on the 21st ult., aged 70.
Peters, Rev. Thomas, B.A., at 25, Circus, Bath, on the 26th ult., aged 78.
Pratt, Rev. Julian, late Vicar of Challock, at Lansdowne Villa Maidstone, on the 28th ult., aged 67.
Tollemache, Rev. Hugh Francis, for fifty-eight years Rector of Harrington, at Harrington, on the 2nd inst., aged 87.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.—III.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington, Hants.

A Course of Sermons preached in Lymington Church during Lent.

And when He had fasted forty days and forty nights He was afterward an hungered. And when the tempter came to Him, he said, If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."—Matt. iv. 2, 3, 4.

WE are led by these words to the prayerful consideration of the first of the three temptations mentioned by the evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Luke, wherewith the blessed Saviour was tempted of the devil in the wilderness.

We must not, however, suppose that the three temptations recorded by the evangelists comprise the whole of the temptations wherewith the blessed Saviour was tried by the wicked one. Far otherwise! they are indeed brought before us by the Spirit of God as illustrating the varied manner in which He was tempted, or, perhaps, as forming within themselves three of the principal temptations of Satan, and they are written for our learning; but we read in St. Luke that He was "forty days tempted of the devil"; and we have reason to believe that during those forty days the temptations were incessant, and it is more than likely that during those forty days the blessed Saviour continued without sleep. Unlike the disciples in the Garden of Gethsemane, who "slept for sorrow," He continued to watch and pray; but wherever He went the devil was by His side, constantly haunting Him even in the hours of His prayers and intercessions with God." And now we may suppose that the forty days are drawing to their close, for we are told that "when they were ended afterward He hungered." Now with this passage of Scripture before us. Let us consider first the fasting of our Lord, then the temptation connected with it, and the manner in which the Saviour met that temptation.

And first looking at the fasting of the blessed Jesus we see that it extended over the whole of the forty days and forty nights of His temptation, and that it consisted in His total abstinence from food; for we are told by St. Luke that "in those days He did eat nothing." Now we are led to inquire how the human nature of Christ could really sustain a fast of such duration and intensity? There are some who meet the difficulty by supposing that the Saviour was supported during this time by the miraculous interposition of God. With this view I cannot quite agree. There is indeed a mystery connected with the person of the Redeemer, and specially on the subject of His temptation which we do not profess to understand, and which we are told "the angels desire to look into." It is, therefore, with holy reverence we should speak on such a subject. There are some again who, considering that the Saviour was made like unto us in all things sin only except, think that therefore the purity of His human nature was capable of sustaining a fast of such a duration. With us indeed it is otherwise; our physical constitution is so distempered and impregnated with sin that we are liable to sink unless constantly supported by food. Well may we say in the prayer of the Litany, "By the mystery of Thy holy incarnation, fasting and temptation, good Lord deliver us." There are two fasts mentioned in the Old Testament with which we may compare and contrast the fast of the Saviour. It is said of Moses, the Law-giver of Israel, that "he went up into the Mount, and was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights, and he did neither eat bread or drink water"; but be it observed that during those forty days Moses was on the Mount with the Lord, whereas the blessed Jesus was in the wilderness with the devil. We are told of Elijah again that he went for forty days and forty nights till he came to Horeb, the Mount of God; but then he had been twice fed by an angel, and he went "in the strength of that meat"; whereas the blessed Saviour was in the dreary wilderness with the wild beasts. But we see in the Saviour's fasting that the types of the Old Testament were all fulfilled in Him, for "of Him Moses in the Law and the Prophets did write Jesus of Nazareth the Son of Joseph."

But here we may reverently ask, What was the *object and the end of the Saviour's fasting?* To which I reply it may probably have been in a measure to fit and to fortify Him for the terrible encounter with the devil; for though there was nothing in the human nature of Christ that needed to be subdued and mortified, for "in Him was no sin," yet we find on one occasion in answer to the question of the disciples concerning a devil, "Why could not we cast him out?" He tells them this kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting. It may be therefore that the Spirit of God, in leading Him to be tempted of the devil, directed that He should be prepared to meet the assaults of the wicked one by fasting as well as by prayer. And here the blessed Jesus is an example to His people as to the time and manner in which they should give themselves to fasting, not, indeed, as a penance, but as a means of grace that (as expressed in the Collect for the First Sunday in Lent)

"our flesh being subdued to the Spirit, we may ever obey Thy Godly notions in righteousness and true holiness." Fasting, indeed, is not enjoined in the Bible as is prayer; it is rather presupposed, and directions are given as to the manner in which we should practice it. It is not enjoined because it is not suited to all persons and to all occasions. "Ye cannot make the children of the Bride-chamber fast while the Bridegroom is with them, but the days will come when the Bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast in those days." You cannot properly call upon a poor man who is spent for want of sufficient nourishment and food to fast, it would be a mockery of his weakness; but they who are strong and of full habits may profitably fast as a means whereby the "flesh may be subdued to the Spirit." In fact, fasting must be regulated by the constitution of the body and the circumstances under which you are placed. The same rule cannot properly be laid down for all. And therefore it is that God says, "Is not this the fast that I have chosen to loose the bands of wickedness to undo the heavy burdens? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? When thou seest the naked that thou cover him" (Isaiah lviii. 8). And thus the rich man fasts by giving of his substance and denying himself to meet the necessities of the poor, while the hungry man fasts by partaking of the bread that strengthens his body to do the work and the will of God. But one thing should be specially observed in our fastings, and that is, the direction of the blessed Saviour as to the manner of observing it. Moreover, "When ye fast be not as the hypocrites of a sad countenance, but thou when thou fastest anoint thy head and wash thy face that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in heaven, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." But, again, the fasting of Jesus may be considered as a part of the great work of expiation by which He atoned for the sins of a guilty world. His work, indeed, was ended on the Cross, but it was begun and continued all through His life of sorrows; and, therefore, when we see Him fasting in the wilderness as well as fainting in the Garden of Gethsemane, we see Him "wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our transgressions." The first Adam, be it remembered, fell in the garden by eating of the fruit of the tree which God commanded him that he should not eat. It was meet, therefore, that the second Adam should begin the work of atonement by fasting forty days and forty nights. But, indeed, the fasting of the blessed Saviour in the wilderness was needed in order that He might meet the devil on his own chosen ground, and under circumstances where he might adapt his temptations to the need in which the Saviour was placed, that so in all places and under all circumstances it might be seen that Jesus, as the Captain of our salvation, was stronger than the strong man armed.

2. But now let us consider the temptation wherewith he was tempted of the devil. "When the tempter came to Him"—observe the name by which the devil is here called—"the *tempter*." He is called by various names in the Word of God—"The Devil, Satan, that Old Serpent, the God of this World"—but howsoever called he is still "the tempter" of God's people, adapting his temptations to the various times and circumstances of the case. The tempter, we are told, "came to Him." It is probable that up to this time he had been invisible, plying, indeed, the righteous Soul of the blessed Saviour with strong and subtle temptations, but not approaching the Redeemer in a visible form. But now "he came to Him," transforming himself probably into an angel of light, or assuming the personal appearance of a friend who felt deep interest in His work and sympathy with His sufferings, and commending himself to the confidence of the Redeemer; and it is thus that he still comes to the people of God, now plying them with his fiery darts, stirring up evil thoughts and feelings within them, and now approaching under the form of a friend, tendering advice or whispering temptations into the ear in the soft accents of Christian sympathy and feeling, but in every fashion and form he is still "the tempter." Now, mark the manner of his address to the Saviour: "If," he says, "Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." If Thou be the Son of God, suggesting a doubt, and thus trying to undermine the faith of the Redeemer in His eternal sonship. He had heard, doubtless, the voice from heaven, "This is My beloved Son," and his first object was to drown that voice by dark doubts and evil suggestions, "If Thou be the Son of God." But can it be? What, left here in the wilderness alone, forsaken of God and man, without friend, without food! Would God leave His beloved Son so? By suggestions such as these we may suppose the evil one tried to awake doubts in the mind of the blessed Redeemer, and then through the doubt to find an entrance for his temptation, "If then Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." Now mark the *terrible subtlety* of this temptation. He appealed to two of the strongest feelings in the nature of the Redeemer; one grounded on the state of His body at the time, for "he hungered," one of the strongest feelings of human nature—extreme hunger! "Surely it cannot be right if Thou be the Son of God that Thou shouldest be reduced to this state, when God has given Thee the power to relieve Thy want, command that these stones be made bread." Oh, how strong, yet how subtle the temptation, for, indeed, under ordinary circumstances it is difficult to see why the Saviour should not exercise His power to create bread for Himself as He did afterwards to

relieve the wants of the multitude in the wilderness. But being placed there in the wilderness without food to meet the temptations of the devil, to have yielded to his suggestions would have been to doubt the providential care of God for Him. Satan would have triumphed, and the work of man's redemption been ruined. And yet the suggestion was in every way plausible, for it appealed, not only to the strongest feelings of humanity, but to the sense of the glory of God in the heart of the Redeemer. "If Thou be indeed the Son of God, by the display of that power that God has committed to His Son, prove it, command these stones that they be made bread." God has said that of "these stones He is able to raise up children unto Abraham;" then let these stones testify that Thou art the Son of God, at once relieve Thy hunger, and prove Thy Sonship. In some such language as this the tempter appealed to the feelings of the blessed Redeemer.

So of old did he tempt our first parent Eve in the garden. "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden." "Surely it cannot be," and thus leading her to doubt the command of God, till, "seeing that the tree was good for food, pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat." Alas, that he should so often succeed in bringing the sons and daughters of men into sin, guilt, and shame. But the Son of God stood firm in the hour of temptation. "The tempter came unto Him," but "found nothing in Him."

3. But now let us look at the *manner in which the Saviour met the temptation of the wicked one.* It was by an appeal to the Word of God—"It is written." Indeed, it is to be noted that He met this and every temptation in the same way by a direct appeal to Scripture. It might have been otherwise. The blessed Saviour might have answered Satan out of the wisdom of His heart without reference to the Word of God, but then He would not have been equally an example to His people, for we might feel that the wisdom of His nature supplied Him with resources which we do not possess; but when He met every temptation by an appeal to the written Word of God he has left us an example as to the manner in which we too can meet the temptations of the wicked one. And blessed be God His Word is open to all. It has lost none of its power; it is still the "Sword of the Spirit," "Sharper, indeed, than any two-edged sword piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." This is the weapon of our warfare, which is still "mighty to the pulling down of the strongholds of sin and Satan." Soldiers of the Cross practice the use of this weapon, be "mighty in the Scriptures," and then ye shall be men of renown.

The particular passage which the Saviour here used is taken from the Book of Deuteronomy, 8th chapter and 3rd verse, and, indeed, it is remarkable that all the passages of Scripture which the Saviour employed are taken from the same book—the Book of Deuteronomy—a portion of Scripture not much read by Christians. The Saviour employed it, perhaps, to teach us the duty and importance of attending to every part of the Bible, and to show us that the dealings of God with the Children of Israel were typical of His dealings with His people. The passage is most appropriate to the occasion. It is part of the solemn address which Moses delivered to the Children of Israel on the subject of the manna with which God fed them in the wilderness for forty years, that he might teach them that "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." It is that which sustains His people in life and being—bread is but the means that He employs. He can dispense with that or use other means for the support of life as he did with Israel in the wilderness. So the Saviour's answer really is, "God can support Him without bread, as he did Israel in the wilderness," and, therefore, He rejects the proposal of the devil to command for His support the stones to be made bread. How comforting and sustaining is this passage of God's Word to the poor and needy of God's people! God is the Author and Sustainer of your life, in Him we live and move and have our being." Without His blessing we may have all the luxuries of life, and yet be poor and miserable. With His blessing we can and will be happy in any circumstances of life. Better to die in the path of honour and duty to our God than to sustain life by dishonesty and sin, for "the blessing of the Lord it maketh rich, and he addeth no sorrow with it."

Learn, my brethren, from the subject before us that in all places and under all circumstances you are *exposed to the temptations of the devil.* In the wilderness, in the house of prayer, in the time of fasting, you are liable to be tempted; nay, the devil may even convert your spiritual exercises into means of temptation by fostering within you a spirit of self-righteousness and pride. Be on your guard, "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation."

But learn for your *encouragement* that you are always safe with Jesus for your Guide and the Word of God for your weapon of defence. Keep close then to Jesus. Study His Word, acquaint thyself with God and be at peace. Resist the devil and he will flee from you. Continue instant in prayer, for "Satan trembles when he sees the weakest saint upon his knees." So Satan shall not have the dominion over you. His very temptations will prove the stability of your faith; and so "the trial of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, shall be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ."

THE NOBILITY OF MAN.

By the Rev. T. SELBY HENREY, Curate of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, in the City of London.

Four Lectures Preached in the Parish Church of St. Botolph, Aldersgate, on the Sunday Evenings of January 26th, February 2nd, 9th, 16th, 1890.

Lecture IV.

"What is Man? Thou madest him *for a little while* lower than the angels: Thou crownedst him with glory and honour."—Hebrews ii. 6, 7.

THE study of astronomy has given us the knowledge that the ray of light emitted from each star in the heavenly heights does not reach our eye at the same time, but after an interval longer or shorter, according to the distance of the star; and that, as a consequence of this, we do not see the star as it actually is, but as it was at the time when the ray of light was transmitted.

Thus we see the moon as it was a second and a quarter before; the sun as it was about eight minutes before; the Polar star as it was forty-eight years ago. And the light shot forth from a star of the eleventh magnitude on the night when David found himself absorbed in wonder at the architecture of the canopy of heaven, analyzing that momentous question "what is man?"—has only just reached this planet.

The practical lesson which results from this truth is God's method of revealing His spiritual light to men. Man was not to be dazzled, but the light was to dawn upon him by degrees. The Bible was not designed to be of the nature of Acts of Parliament for the abolition of all wrongs; but it was rather to be an educational force, and to flash its beneficent rays into the prospective generations. If then the method was to be educational, it could not be immediate, but progressive.

In the Old Testament then, we read the history of an education, in part we trace the discipline of the people of Israel: and throughout God teaches how he wishes to lead men into the knowledge of purer laws and more holy modes of living. And when we come to the New Testament we find the same law of spiritual growth. The spiritual discernment of the disciples was not at first so clear as it afterwards became; this deduction may be drawn from reading between the lines of that last conversation between the risen Christ and His disciples. "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom of Israel?" But in another ten days the glimmering light became clearer, and they gained more perfect knowledge of that light which shines more and more to the perfect day.

It is needless to linger for a proof of this principle, the New Testament bears on every page evidences of the educational process of life. At the dawn of the Exemplar's life we read that the Holy Child "increased in wisdom:" St. Paul would have the Athenians recognise that the character of men should improve from age to age, the perfection of one generation ought not to be the standard of the succeeding one, for each should reach after some higher ideal, when he said "God who in times past overlooked the sins of their ancestors," and again, "these things happened unto our fathers by way of example, and they were written for our admonition."

The moral code has not changed any more than have the laws of steam and electricity, but we must ever distinguish between the immutable laws of God, and the advancement of human knowledge; between eternal laws of rectitude and man's education in the knowledge of those laws. The truth I wish to convey is this, that as the shaft of light transmitted from each star does not reach the earth at the same time, so God's method has been to convey the light of truth by degrees, and to educate the heart of man. To deal with the heart of man, not as with inanimate things which are made, but as with an animate, ever-living being, who is to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of Christ and his future high destiny until the day breaks and the shadows flee away. Following out this conclusion, we are not surprised at the fact that the lamp of truth burns more brightly to-day than when David penned the eighth Psalm.

We will now examine Scripture as it bears on man's inheritance hereafter. Allow these words found in the Thessalonians to be the bridge to carry us over from one period of prophecy to another, viz., "having made known unto us the mystery of His will, according to His good pleasure, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one all things in Christ." We have now the realization of the midnight visions of the Psalmist's times, "for we are the children of the light, and the children of the day." We are now in a position to say that the ideal eighth Psalm is realized in Christ, and all that man was to be we see in Him.

For the solution of David's question let us turn to the Hebrews, in the second chapter, and the fourteenth verse, we find the foundations of the whole matter. "He took of the seed of Abraham and enshrined the Divine nature in human flesh and blood—man's re-coronation in Christ. As so continually stated in the Creed, the right faith of the Incarnation is "that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the world, and man, of the substance of His mother, born in the world; perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting; equal to the Father, as touching His Godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching His manhood. Who although He be God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ." "Let it be observed," says Archdeacon Wilberforce, that "by this union with Deity there

has been conferred upon our whole race the greatest honour of which created substance is susceptible. For that manhood should thus have been taken into Godhead shows that there was between them such *compatibility* as stamps the lower nature with that truth which belongs to the very essence of the higher. But man was found susceptible of it—that his faculties required to be exalted, not destroyed, shows that the traces of that image in which He was first created, had not been obliterated from His soul." And Professor Westcott remarks that "Christ did not simply become *a man; he* became *man*."

Moreover, the ascension of the risen God-man, Christ Jesus, is neither to be understood metaphorically, nor as a dissolution of the hypostatical union; but as a real local translation of the man Christ Jesus into heaven. Such a translation was necessary that He might be man's representative, mediator and sympathiser at the throne of God. As the weary traveller leaves the dusty high road and penetrates some by-path, and there finds himself surrounded by meadow flowers and birds too timid for the open, so let us leave for a moment the high road of argument for a question which may be considered to be of the nature of a side issue. I refer to the destiny of the body, and as the view I am about to advance is reckoned by a few to be quixotic, I will not present it in my own words, but in language made use of by no less a preacher than Canon Liddon: "Respect for the human body after death," he says, "is a natural result of Christian belief that the inanimate form lying before us is not utterly gone for ever; that it certainly has a future. Just as the body of the Lord Jesus, after His human soul had parted from it, and had descended into the region of the imprisoned dead, was carefully wrapped in linen and laid in a tomb until the morn of Easter, so ever since have the bodies of departed Christians been looked upon with some portion of the faith and love of Nicodemus and Joseph; for they too, we know, will rise. We are not handling a lump of decaying matter, which has lost its interest for ever, and which will presently be resolved into its chemical constituents, to be recombined no more." It is told of the late Archbishop Whately that, when he lay in agony on his deathbed, his chaplain tried to comfort him with the portion of Scripture commencing with the words Who will change our vile body (Philip. iii. 21). "Read it," the Archbishop said, "again." The chaplain read the passage from our English Bible. "Read it," said the dying prelate, "in the apostle's own words," "Who shall change the body of our humiliation." "Ah," said the archbishop, "that is it, nothing that God has made is vile." Doubtless we have often taken in our hand a chrysalis, and does it not look deformed? Is there not a taint and smell of earth about it? But wait for a bright summer-day, and then we shall see the inner life bursting from its body of humiliation—and there flutters in the clear blue sky a beautiful painted butterfly. So with us; how like this body of humiliation is to that chrysalis; but a bright summer day will come, and our inner-selves will burst asunder the body of our humiliation, and we shall be transformed from poor worms of earth to bright angels of light. This is not all, the following words on future recognition are from the Life of the great Bishop S. Wilberforce: "I cannot doubt that there will be in the future world some glorified and exalted counterpart of every earthly relation, for nothing which is real dies in God's world but to experience a better resurrection. When God has knit together two in one, when the great mystery of Christian marriage has united two into one, in all the fulness of its Christian meaning, when there has been union in prayer and aspirations, I do not doubt for one moment that there will be a golden counterpart of all this in that world. This seems clear to me, from our Lord's promise to Martha of Bethany, 'Thy brother shall rise again.' It was not Lazarus who should rise, but 'her brother' and our Lord could not mock the expectations which He raised, and yet—this He would have done, if he was not to rise again as *her* brother. No doubt the personal identity will be preserved, and the resurrection body of the risen saint will be his own body glorified and not the body of another."

But we have roamed too far; let us return to the subject of the Incarnation, and we are expressly told that Christ took not the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham, with an outstretched arm to raise poor fallen man to a higher platform, bestowing a fresh dignity and nobility upon him, inspiring him with purer aspirations and loftier conceptions, ennobling his character, and breathing a holy benediction over the whole world.

The blessings that flow from the Incarnation and Atonement are man's by personally appropriating them by faith, a doctrine so well defined by judicious Hooker in the following words: "Yet even the man which in himself is full of sin: him being found in Christ through faith, and having his sin in hatred through repentance; him God beholdeth with a gracious eye, putteth away his sin by not imputing it, taketh quite away the punishment due thereunto, by pardoning it; and accepting him in Jesus Christ, as perfectly righteous, as if he had fulfilled all that is commanded in the law; shall I say more perfectly righteous than if he himself had fulfilled the whole law? as the Apostle saith, 'God made Him which knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.'"

Though the Divine image in man had been coated over with the accretions of sin, yet parental likeness had never been entirely erased, and no curse had ever been passed on man; man was not to be destroyed, but the damage by sin removed, and the likeness restored in that paradise where there

will be no more death, and the former things will have passed away.

And accompanying man's filial relationship or Divine resemblance to God, man by his adoption will inherit in the fullest sense of the term all the joys which are at God's right hand; and it is well to remember that the adoption which St. Paul had in his mind was that of the Roman law, which bestowed on the adopted child the same exact status and privileges as the natural child would be entitled to. The prodigal son once disinherited is now restored to an all-loving Father. The meanest soul and the most jaded body become the temples of the Holy Ghost, and there steals into the most humble Christian's breast the chord of sweet buoyant love, the keynote of a new life, what man is in God's own reckoning: "I, too, am a child of God by faith in Jesus, and if a child, then an heir, an heir of God, and joint heir with Christ," "joint heir with Christ, because His Father is our Father, and He is not ashamed to call us brethren."

The Incarnation has lifted humanity to Christ's level, and has brought all men, one by one, into the new relationship to God and His Christ. Let us pause at such a stupendous privilege, that we not only have Christ as our Brother on the throne of Divine Majesty, but are also ourselves with Him to be raised to the same royal dignity!

Man entering into these new relationships, and Christ having entered this earthly tabernacle, and purified it by His indwelling, like as He entered and purified the Temple of Jerusalem. He is earnestly expecting and waiting "for the manifestation of the sons of God," and it may be well for us to remind ourselves that the Greek word is a picture in itself. It is the expectation of a man with head erect, straining out afar towards the direction from which the succour is to come, namely, "the glorious liberty of the children of God"—to the time when man will be a little short of God, in the same degree as a son is second in position to his father.

And having equality with his Elder-Brother Christ, while the very angels—who are mentioned in the Bible as having ministered to his necessities some three-hundred times—will be man's inferiors. "For the holy angels will be of lower rank than the beings whose nature has been so glorified by the Incarnation."

Angels sometimes mentioned as guardian spirits of individuals, and whose power is designated in Scripture by dominions, principalities, powers, which in themselves, again have distinctions of position and rank. But a sway over this planet is never ascribed to them, neither over the world of creation, nor over that of redemption; even now, in a sense, they are not man's superiors. To which of the angels saith He at any time, sit on My right hand? the throne is for man—"the angels are all ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation."

Christ's companions on that throne at God's right hand will be men. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me in my throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with My Father in His throne." The Eastern throne being much broader than ours, so that there would be room upon it for other persons, besides him who occupied, as by right, the central position. The idea that the context conveys, may be, that Christ would occupy the central place among His brethren, and play the same part as St. Peter did among the Apostles—chief among equals.

According to this figurative language, man will therefore share Christ's throne as Christ shared His Father's. Two thrones are mentioned, My throne, saith Christ; this is the condition of the redeemed who sit with Christ in His throne. But My Father's throne is the power of Divine Majesty, herein none sit but God and the God-man, Jesus Christ.

The honour so great that it passes man's understanding will be man's only, because Christ reigns, and because He is pleased to share His glories with them in the fulfilment of these promises. "The glory which Thou gaveth Me I have given them, that they may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me," "If so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together."

The sources and guarantee of this brilliant destiny of all mankind, if they will only accept it, is, the Blood of the Lamb, the word of their testimony, and a lively faith.

But this is not all, those "all things, which are to be put in subjection," under man's feet, in short, there is nothing that will not be put under him; this union between the Eternal Vine and the branches is so complete, that by virtue of this union man having been exempted from judgment through faith, he will become a partner in Christ's judicial authority. A scintillation of this truth flashes upon mankind when Daniel speaks of the judgment given to the saints of the Most High, and the time that the saints possessed the kingdom. And none other than the Divine Master asserts in forcible language to His Apostles, "ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," and again re-echoed by St. Paul to the Corinthian Church: "Do ye not know that the saints (in no restricted sense, but any holy person) shall judge the world? . . . . Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" A judicial power first applied to terrestrial and then to celestial beings. Man shall be a king, because he shall overcome the world, mortify sin, govern his own spirit, conquer Satan, judge the world at the great assize. Man shall be as a priest, having access to God, enabled to enter the Holiest, to offer spiritual and acceptable sacrifices.

These astounding and awe-inspiring truths are

like narrow vistas; ah! surprises, in that future which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, things which God hath prepared for them that love him. May we not follow the Apostle's argument, and say, "For what man knoweth the things of a man? but the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him." In this age of ours when there is a tendency to accept everything as inspired but the one great inspired volume; and when nearly everything is accepted as true but what is found therein, I may be forgiven if I narrate one more incident, this time to show how Christ has been compared with this world's greatest intellects in bygone days, for concrete examples are ever better than abstract sermonizing. The following story is recorded to have occurred at one of the Wednesday evening meetings at the house of Charles Lamb. It was at a meeting in 1826, that Charles Lamb started a question as to "persons whom one would wish to have seen." An animated conversation took place. Sir Isaac Newton, and Locke, and Shakespeare, and Ben Jonson, and Sir Thomas Brown, and Milton, and Chaucer, and Spencer, and Dante, and Pope, and Dryden, and others found supporters. Great painters and philosophers and conquerors were strongly urged, and as strongly controverted. At length a pause ensued, and the subject seemed well nigh exhausted. The temporary silence was broken by Lamb saying, "There is only one other person that I can think of after these," but without uttering a Name that once put on the semblance of mortality: "If Shakespeare were to come into this room, we should all rise to meet him, but if that Person were to come into it, we should fall down and try to kiss the hem of His garment."

Christianity exhibits a system of truths which cluster round a centre in the Incarnation of Christ. And as Christ learnt obedience for man's sake, man must also learn the same virtue for his Elder-Brother's sake. As Christ grew in wisdom man must learn here below what man is to do; namely, to fling away his proud ideas of self, crucify his old nature, and develop and mature that childlike simplicity and trust without which no man shall enter into those pleasures which are at God's right hand for evermore.

God's desire is not to destroy man, but to restore him to the Divine Image; so also the kingdom of Heaven is in its noblest sense "the restitution of all things," a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. "Behold, I make all things new," in the sense of "nothing that defileth shall enter," for it is sin alone that creates disorder, producing pain and death. The ancient curse will be revoked when the devil is finally overcome, and then will be ushered in the reign of perfect renovation and exaltation of the time when all things were "pronounced as very good."

Thus the Christian's hope is based on holiness in the adjusting of our character, for says Chalmers: "Heaven is character; 'to grow up unto Him in all things' is the Christian's highest aspiration." And in that newness of life, mankind will return to the youth of Eden; what the first man Adam forfeited by disobedience will be regained through the obedience of the second Adam.

The river of life for those who have thirsted for holiness, and on either side of the river of life the amaranthine tree of life bearing ambrosial fruit in perennial succession, no longer fenced with a flaming sword, but accessible to all for the healing of the nations. Here truly may be bought wine and milk without money, and without price, in this Eternal City which lieth four-square, and whose portals face to every point of the compass, offering access to every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. Men who after passing through the purifying fires of great tribulation shall come forth, phœnix-like from their ashes, with robes purified, "and made white in the blood of the Lamb: the body of the humiliation then fashioned like unto His glorified body." "We shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

Instead of lamenting—

> "Oh, for the touch of the vanished hand,
> And for the sound of the voice that is still,"

sorrow will be turned into gladness:

> "And with this morn those angels faces smile
> Which we have loved long since, and lost awhile."

"God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things will have passed away.

But, stay, language is too inadequate to express what God has prepared for them who love Him. We exclaim with the sweet Psalmist of Israel, "such knowledge is too wonderful, it is high, man cannot attain unto it," we must wait till "prophecy will fade away, melting in the light of day, till faith will vanish into sight;" when with glorified bodies and characters sublimated from all earthly dross, with greater rapidity than light we shall—

> "Wing our way from star to star
> From world to luminous world as far
> As creation spreads her blazing wall"

penetrate those dominions of the Omnipotent where space is bridged over and time shall be no more, behold, admire, and adore—join that great multitude which no man could number, and accompany the harpers, harping with their harps, shall make the choirs of the New Jerusalem ring, "resting not day and night, saying, Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."

With this high goal before thee, O man, look not mournfully into the past—it cometh not again: wisely improve the present, it is within thy grasp; cultivate character so that it may be an Æolian

harp to be ever converting the discordant voices of earth into God's own sweet music, thereby the path to Heaven will lead through Heaven, and all the way to Heaven will be Heaven. Go forth to meet the future utilizing each golden moment so that that kingdom of love may be hastened in which heaven is a part of earth—and earth made the portal of Heaven.

ERRATA.—In consequence of the author's revision not arriving in time, there are a few errors in Mr. Maturin's sermon of last week, viz.: On page 109, first column, line 15, *when* for *where;* on page 110, first column, line 35, *book word* for *God's word;* on page 110, first column, line 37, *devil* for *prince;* on page 111, first column, line 36, *nature sin* for *nature of sin.*

THE first two of the Bampton lectures have been now delivered. Their subject is "Modern Criticism in its Relation to the Fourth Gospel." The first two lectures have dealt with the evidence for the authenticity and authorship of the fourth Gospel in the three generations of the second century. Archdeacon Watkins, without producing much that is new on the subject, has shown that he is a skilful controversialist and an able wriier, and has restated the case in favour of the traditional view with great clearness and fulness —a clearness and fulness so great that it leaves little to be desired or added.

AN influential meeting of the clergy and the leading laymen of the diocese of Bangor was held in the Chapter Room of the cathedral on Monday week to consider the best steps to adopt to mark the appreciation of Bishop Campbell's long and faithful services to the Church in Wales. The proceedings were of a private character, but it is understood that a committee was formed to carry out the arrangements, and that his lordship will probably be asked to accept a portrait of himself. The *Nonconformist* says that general regret is felt throughout North Wales at the retirement of Bishop Campbell. "His appointment by Lord Derby was considered by many a gross injustice to the Welsh people, and an injury to religion itself. But time tempers all things. The good Bishop learnt the Welsh language, and won his way to the hearts of the Welsh people."

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noses in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1890.

POPULAR CONTROL.

IT is admitted on all sides, that the question of free or assisted education, is, for the time at any rate, put on the shelf. But while this may be the case, it behoves all friends of the Church to be doubly on their guard. The statement made by Mr. John Morley in the House of Commons, that Roman Catholic and Jewish schools should be exempted from what is known as Popular Control, because the children attending such schools would be drawn from a specific class, was clearly a bid for the Irish vote, and, of course, if such a measure were to pass Denominational schools must be ultimately thrown over in favour of Board schools, where the Bible is banished and religious teaching excluded.

The idea of vesting schools under what is known as Popular Control is evidently a bribe to catch the unwary, and we all know that in many places there is a great desire among some to be in office, and so to have the opportunity of airing their crotchets. This is very often seen in School Board elections. Men have been known to put up for election on these Boards who possess the smallest attainments, and who, if put through an examination by the Government Inspector would hardly pass the fourth standard; and we have also known the case of a manager of a Denominational school, who in going through the registers, before entering the same in the Log Book, has been obliged to ask the schoolmaster how to spell certain words. Of course these may be, and doubtless are, isolated cases, yet the question forces itself upon us: If the proposals of certain Members of Parliament are carried, shall we not have a great number of such

managers, or such members of a Board? because after all in many places we must take the best we can get, and where there is a dearth of gentlemen fitted to take their place on such a Board then we must perforce use the materials all ready to hand.

A further question arises. What are to be the functions of such a body? The clergy who have bravely struggled to maintain their schools, and to keep pace with the ever-shifting requirements of educational codes, and the whims and crotchets of the various Ministers of Education as they come into office, and who have also upheld the importance of religious teaching as the groundwork of all other educations; are they to be ousted from their position to give way to a cry for Popular Control, because assistance is to be given to the schools from the rates, or other sources, under the name of free or assisted education? The idea from beginning to end is preposterous. It is hard to tell what is the meaning of all these varied attempts. Is it because the enemies of the Church find that Disestablishment is hardly a safe card to play at present; is it that if a movement in favour of the separation of Church from State, and the alienation of its endowments, takes place, a further breach might be made which would require a great deal of ingenuity to heal, is it that therefore a mine is sprung, a side attack made, now againtst the Denominational schools, in order to weaken the power of the Church over her children, now against the payment of tithes, and so to weaken the endowments of the Church, and embitter the relationship between the vicar or rector and his parishioners? It is also curious to notice that two of strongest opponents of the Church are the grandson of an archbishop and the son of a beneficed clergymen—Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Osborne Morgan. Churchmen need especially to be on their guard in these days, and to watch very carefully the various stratagems adopted to weaken the Church's influence, and to resolve quietly, but firmly to act on the defensive.

But what would be the result on the country at large if free education were brought about. Of course, it would be a terrible struggle to maintain the voluntary schools against such terrible odds, and the calling in Popular Control would embroil many a parish in something like civil war; because very often it happens that the smaller the place is, the greater the turmoil; but the greatest evil of all would be the destroying of that spirit of independence, which has always marked the Englishman, to be no longer obliged to pay the school-pence for his children, is at once pauperizing and degrading, and the results instead of elevating the moral tone will have the opposite effect.

Mr. Caine in his book entitled "A Trip round the World" speaks in terms of praise of the Canadian system of free education, but he forgets entirely that Canada is, comparatively speaking, a new country, opened out through the energy of emigrants, etc., and that which is found useful in a new country cannot be so freely introduced into this land. Surely we have had enough to bear in the way of rates and taxes since the introduction of School Boards, that we can hardly face the further burden of making education entirely free. Neither are we as Churchmen prepared to give up our voluntary schools, raised and supported by our own exertions, without a tremendous struggle.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—In a previous letter I mentioned that out of the whole 415 words given in Dr. Hobart's Index, all but about 65 are to be found in Schleusner's Lexicon of the Septuagint.* Thus 350 of the words are to be found in the Septuagint—65 *only* are *not* to be found therein. Of these remaining 65 words, no less than 15 have a *Jewish* connection: ἀναπέμπειν is peculiar to St. Luke's writings and to St. Paul, "A Pharisee, and a Hebrew of the Hebrews"; εὐθυμεῖν is peculiar to St. Luke's writings and to St. James, "A rigid observer of the Mosaic ritual, a regular worshipper in the Temple" (Farrar). Five others are to be found in the works of Josephus, Pharisee and priest, the contemporary of St. Paul, namely: ἀσιτία, εὐφορεῖν, παροτρύνειν, πίμπρασθαι, προσρήγνυμι. Eight more occur in Aquila's Greek Version of the Hebrew Scriptures, made in the early part of the second century on behalf of the Jews, in order to refute the Christian quotations from the LXX. "Aquila," says Dean Prideaux, "stuck closely and servilely to the letter." "Aquila's Version is said to have been rather a good dictionary to give the meaning of the Hebrew words, than a good interpretation to unfold to us the sense of the text." These eight words, common to St. Luke's writings and Aquila, which "closely and servilely" render into the Greek tongue Hebrew words from the Old Testament Scriptures, are: ἀνασείειν, ἀποθλίβειν, ἐμπνέειν, εὐπορία, κράββατος, ὀπτός, παρατήρησις, and συκόμορος, the equivalent of συκομορέα, found in Luke xix. Thus, deducting the 15 words now mentioned as having a *distinctly* JEWISH *connection* from the 65 words in Dr. Hobart's list, which are not in Schleusner, we find that there remain only 50 words *altogether* common to St. Luke's writings and the medical authors, which cannot in some way or other be traced either to the Septuagint itself, or to those who had the Septuagint (or the original Hebrew Scriptures) in their hands.

If Dr. Hobart could even now show that his forlorn hope, these 50 words, were peculiar to the medical writers, or were used in any distinctive medical way, he might still, perhaps, claim some shade of a shadow of proof for his theory. *But Dr. Hobart can do nothing of the kind.* Many of these remaining words occur in *several*, while some occur in *many*, of the best-known Greek authors. Thus ὑποβάλλειν and ὑποτρέχειν both are used by *Homer*, *Herodotus*, *Euripides*, *Xenophon*,

* I reserve for future consideration πυρετὸς μέγας, *a great fever*, in which Dr. Hobart sees a medical expression, although "Bleek doubts this, understanding the epithet only of the intensity of the fever."—ALFORD.

Aristophanes, *Plato*, and *Polybius*. What more can we want? How, then, can the fact that Dr. Hobart rightly marks these two common—almost universal—words as peculiar to St. Luke in the New Testament, and as also occurring in the medical writers, be the slightest proof that the author of the Third Gospel was a medical man? If proof there be, then there is equal proof that he was poet, philosopher, and historian. *Fifteen* of these last 50 words, then, occur in Plato, *nine* in Homer, *five* in Herodotus, *three* in Euripides, *three* in Plutarch, two in Xenophon, two in Epictetus, one in Strabo, one in Æschylus, one in Sophocles, one in Aristophanes, one in Aristotle, and one in Theophrastus, the pupil and successor of Aristotle. The one word in Theophrastus is the rare one σκωληκόβρωτος, whereby hangs a tale, for it is reported that some luckless wight in a University examination could bethink himself of no better rendering of σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν than this: "Having filled the office of *skolekobrote*, he ended his life in that capacity." Returning to the argument, we have thus 45 out of the last 50 words accounted for, without any calling in of the doctors—most of these 45 words occurring, as I have said, in *more than one* of the well-known Greek (non-medical) writers. Of the remaining five words, *three* are *absolutely* peculiar to St. Luke, occurring nowhere else in the whole range of extant Greek literature, namely, ἀνεύθετος (εὔθετος, however, is found in the *Jewish* writings, Psalms and Hebrews), ὀχλοποιεῖν (as *one* word), and συνθρύπτειν, none of which, strictly speaking, have any business in Dr. Hobart's list, inasmuch as they do *not* occur in the medical writers, but are, as I have said, found *only* in St. Luke.

The fourth word, βελόνη, belongs to a disputed reading, and therefore obviously can *prove* nothing at all. It is not to be found in the text of Wetstein, Griesbach, or Wordsworth, and rests on the authority of Codices B, D, L, ℵ—Codices B and ℵ being, according to the late Dean Burgon, "two of the most untrustworthy copies in existence" ("The Revision Revised," p. 316). Again, p. 30, the Dean refers to "the hopelessness of any attempt to construct the text of the New Testament out of the materials" which, among others, "Codices ℵ, B, D supply," although to these "it is just now the fashion to bow down as to an oracular voice, from which there shall be no appeal." As for Codex L, Dr. Scrivener informs us that it bears "a strong resemblance to Codex B"—which, as I have mentioned, Dean Burgon calls "*untrustworthy*." Thus no argument can be founded on the use of βελόνη, for there is really no trustworthy evidence that it *is* used in the Third Gospel at all.

I have now dealt with 49 out of the last 50 words in Dr. Hobart's list which remained for consideration. There consequently is left only the last of the Mohicans, to be regarded with a certain melancholy interest as the sole survivor of the dozen columns or so in Dr. Hobart's Index, escaping scatheless from that fierce light of criticism which ever beats upon a learned work. Out of the whole lordly pile of medical words supposed to exist in the Third Gospel, which has now melted away like the baseless fabric of a vision, at the Ithuriel touch of sober criticism, there remains what? One insignificant word used in a non-medical way. The mysterious word ἀνωτερικός remains alone in its glory as the grand foundation of the medical myth, now, I trust, for ever disposed of. For this one word ἀνωτερικός, as I have already candidly confessed, the only authority prior to the Acts of the Apostles is Hippocrates. As, however, it is retained in the modern Greek Testament, and as modern Greek appears to be derived from the spoken language of the country districts (Matthiæ, Gr. Gram. i. 12), the word may have been on the lips of the people, although unrecorded in the pages of literature. "We are continually reminded of the existence throughout the history of the Greek language (at any rate, beginning with the time of Aristophanes) of a common spoken dialect, quite distinct from the cultivated language of literature, but seldom coming to the surface" (Geldart, "Modern Greek," p. 81). Moreover, it may have occurred in some of those ancient works which were destroyed in the fires that consumed the great Library of Alexandria, or which have been otherwise lost to us; *e.g.*, it may have occurred in that large portion of the last 35 books of the "History" of Polybius, which has disappeared. But however this may be, one thing is quite clear, and that is that the theory of the medical authorship of the Third Gospel is wholly unsustained by the evidence, and that in the light of the facts I have now adduced our verdict must simply be, "*It won't do.*"

H. HEBER EVANS.

February 26th, 1890.

CHRIST'S EDUCATION.

SIR,—In your number of the 15th ult. appears a sermon under the above heading. Allow me to make a few remarks on some of the references to our Lord's Divine nature as treated by the writer. It seems to me—I say it with all deference—that we ought to distinguish between our Lord's state of pupilage, in which, although spent in retirement, "He increased in wisdom and in years and in favour with God and man"; and those three years of His ministry, initiated at His Baptism, when the Holy Ghost was poured without measure on Him, in the seven-fold gifts of the Spirit, mentioned in Isaiah. If this be a valid distinction, how can we say of Him as follows: "The Divine Man only gradually learned things as any other man might do. Much He never knew, doubtless, before He was made perfect through suffering and death. For He emptied Himself, as St. Paul declares, when He took our nature on Him; emptied Himself of every Divine prerogative which would have interfered in His appreciation of our state and all its imperfections." Here I am at a loss to see what the writer means. Does he imply that because our Lord took on Him our nature, that therefore His knowledge was in any respect limited; that He who knew "what was in Man," and "their thoughts"; He who said, "believe Me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me"; can it be said that suffering and death were to perfect His knowledge, though He knew beforehand every circumstance that was to be accomplished in Him? What is that Divine prerogative which would have interfered with His full appreciation of our state and its imperfections; and does the possession of it by the Deity prevent His appreciation of our state and its imperfections? This seems startling, no doubt, and would demand explanation. But I hurry on. "To invest Him in His earthly career with all the omniscience of the Deity is to contradict the representation of the Gospels." Before remarking on this sentence, I would refer your readers to the distinction made above between the periods before and after our Lord's Baptism. Any remark now made refers to the latter period. One future fact alone, He does say, was

known only to the Father; but does that prove that He was not otherwise omniscient? Because, in a single instance, the power of casting out a devil was stayed in the case of the disciples, does that prove they did not possess that power, though Gospel history represents they did? To lower that Divine omniscience which His words certainly implied, if they did not authoritatively claim, is perhaps interfering with His Godhead in a manner not allowed to us by the Gospel narrative of His Manhood. He who could assert that "before Abraham was I am," and could also predict His own sentence in judgment, when He shall come in the clouds of heaven, may well claim from us a recognition of an omniscient knowledge, both of the past and future, while He was on earth.

There is another sentence to which I shall refer: "The Spirit which was poured measureless upon Him was not the spirit of anticipated scientific discoveries or critical research, but the spirit of wisdom and holiness, of absolute surrender to the Divine Will, of absolute coincidence with the Divine Mind; and therefore we are not to seek in His utterances authoritative decisions on moot points of history or criticism." Surely the writer cannot mean that prophetic knowledge of the fiery trial of scepticism, through which the Christian Church is now passing, resulting, it may be, in a large extent from that scientific discovery and critical research which characterise the present age, was then denied to Him. That a time, like the present, when His Name is not to be called in witness against those who question His authority, if it run counter to the decisions which their human knowledge has determined — that such a time should be hidden from Him would seem as if we might define the limits to which Divine knowledge, poured measureless on the Son of God, might go, and no further. If we "may not seek in His utterances authoritative decisions on moot points of history or criticism," then are we to rely on the utterances of others on points of sacred history or criticism (as I take it, only these are referred to), even should they seem to contradict His words, who came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil? Are the discoveries in history or criticism, which the so-called march of science has revealed, to be compared with the divine utterances of the Son of God? Must the latter now give way to the former? The creature be set up against the Creator, the finite mind compete with the Infinite, and man's knowledge usurp the place of eternal wisdom; and must the eternal light of the Sun of Righteousness pale and grow dim when brought in contact with the dazzling brilliancy of nineteenth century discoveries and criticism? If the tendency of modern research and discovery be to disparage in any way our Lord's authority, what may we expect the future to unfold? Are His words to come true in a negative sense, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth"? *INQUIRENS.*

PAUL OR JOHN?

SIR,—The last number of the PULPIT, March 8th, contained a letter from Mr. John A. Walker, of Dublin, in which, after referring to a sermon of mine on the temptation of Christ in very kind and flattering terms, he says: "Mr. Maturin refers to a part of the 12th chapter of 2nd Corinthians, and gives to it a construction and interpretation which I consider wholly at variance with the text." And then he says: "I would ask Mr. Maturin why does he assume that Paul refers to himself" in the vision there spoken of? "Would Mr. Maturin kindly say on what authority he makes Paul the subject of this vision?"

In answer to Mr. Walker's request, I can only say that I did so because it is almost universally agreed upon by all writers on the subject that Paul himself was the subject of the vision. I have been always accustomed to think so. I know there are difficulties connected with that view of the subject, but I think the difficulties are much greater on any other hypothesis. Mr. Walker says: "To whom else could he refer but to John." I admire Mr. Walker's lov efor John, but I cannot find the most remote reason for supposing that it was John to whom the Apostle here refers. The whole context leads me to think otherwise. Paul is here combatting the teaching of those whom he describes as "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ, as Satan transformed himself into an angel of light"; men that "gloried after the flesh," fools "whom they suffered gladly." Under these circumstances, being "jealous over them with godly jealousy," he was "compelled," against his own feelings, to glory; but he says, "Ye have compelled me"; but even so he says of himself, "I am a fool in glorying," but "if I must needs glory I will glory of the things which concern my infirmities." No marvel, then, that he wrapped in a kind of mystery the annunciation of that wonderful vision given to him who, whether in the body or out of the body he could not tell, "was caught up to the third heavens, and heard unspeakable things which it was not lawful for a man to utter." True, he speaks of that man in a moment as if he were a different being from himself, but he soon passes from the third person, "*he*," to the first person, "*I*"—"for I will say the truth"; but rebuking himself, "I forbear, lest any man should think of *me* above that which he seeth me to be, or that he heareth of me." And then, throwing off all reserve, he says plainly: "Lest *I* should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me." It was Paul, then, who had the thorn in the flesh. It was Paul who had "the abundance of the revelations," and surely "the abundance of the revelations" refers to the vision of which he has been writing. I could add other reasons to the above for still thinking that Paul, and not John, was the subject of the vision, but I fear I have already trespassed too largely on the space of your valuable REVIEW.

B. MATURIN.

Lymington Vicarage, March 11th, 1890.

A FEW QUESTIONS ON THE SACRAMENTS AS TAUGHT IN THE CHURCH CATECHISM.

QUERY.—How many parts are there in a sacrament? A.—Two; the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace.

Query.—Then the ceremony is not the same as the outward part? A.—No, for it contains the inward grace or gift as well.

Query.—What are the outward parts? A.—The bread and wine in one, which the Lord hath commanded to be received, not merely offered and reserved and gazed at, but eaten and received; and, in the other, water, wherein the person is to be baptised.

Query.—In the first question, "What is the meaning of the word sacrament?" Does it refer to the outer part, or to the whole ceremony? A.—Not the whole ceremony, because the answer gives only one part, "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

Query.—But some say that the means whereby we receive signifies the whole ceremony? A.—This is unreasonable, because if the whole ceremony be the sacrament with its two parts, it is unreasonable to say that the whole two parts is the means whereby we receive one of them. It can be said only of one of them that it is the means whereby we receive the other. The outer part in a sacrament has generally been taken, not for the whole ceremony, but for the visible thing given to us as a means and a pledge. This is what has driven Rome to the necessity of inventing outer gifts in the five newly-invented sacraments of hers. In orders she makes the vessels the outer gift; in Confirmation and Extreme Unction she makes it the oil. Now, if the whole ceremony could stand for the outer part, given unto us as a means and a pledge, she would be in no difficulty, as the ceremony in each of her new sacraments would do for the outer and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

Those who object to the bread being a means whereby we receive grace may just as well object to the whole ceremony being a means. It is as unreasonable to say it goes to all with the means in one case as in the other. To say that either the outer part or the whole ceremony is a means whereby we receive the outer part, or the whole ceremony, is unmitigated nonsense. If anything is a means of our receiving a gift, the gift cannot be the same as what conveys it. An envelope which brings me a cheque cannot be the same as the cheque which it contains. The whole answer may be thus explained. What is an authorised envelope from the Treasury which professes to cover an enclosure? It is an outward and visible sign of an inward invisible remittance. It is a means whereby we receive the enclosure, and its outward form is a pledge to assure me of what it contains.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE ATONEMENT.

SIR,—The letter in which Mr. Sandlands asserts the hopelessness of the future state ought to need no reply, but experience shows that nothing is too absurd to be believed when it is asserted without contradiction. When I call his statements on the subject absurd, I mean more than utterly wrong; I mean wrong with that kind of error which only needs to be properly stated in order to refute itself.

He says that the belief in a final restoration is incompatible with a belief in the Atonement, and that I, who believe in a final restoration, must mean something different from the Atonement when I say I believe in the Atonement. This is saying that if I believe that the Son of God will ultimately be the Saviour of all the lost by the power of His Atonement, I cannot believe that He is the Saviour of any.

He says that if we believe in a final salvation for those who are not saved in the present life, we teach that God acts on inconsistent principles. Now, He who came to seek and to save the lost is the Lord of the dead as well as of the living, and yet Mr. Sandlands maintains that He would be acting inconsistently if He did not, at the entrance of the tomb, cease His pursuit after those whom He came to save.

When it is maintained, on the strength of supposed interpretations of revelation, that God has made mere bodily death a barrier impassable to Himself, against the extension of His mercy into other worlds than this, such a doctrine is to be met with argument; but when it is maintained that such limitation is needed by the character of God as revealed in Christ's Atonement, it only needs to be stated in order to see its absurdity.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 7th March, 1890.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alexander, Rev. Harvey George, Rector of Stoke Rivers, Barnstaple.
Allbrook, Rev. H. O., Curate of St. Paul's, Tottenham; Principal of the Operative Jewish Converts' Institution.
Baseley, Rev. William Linzey, Vicar of All Saints', Rhodes, Lancashire.
Beechey, Rev. St. Vincent, jun., Rector of St. John's, Cheetham; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth.
Candler, Rev. E. T., Vicar of St. Peter's, Stockport; Chaplain of Mottram Hall, Prestbury, Macclesfield.
Close, Rev. A. W. M., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Alkelda, Giggleswick; Vicar of Hutton Magna.
Dickinson, Rev. George Lowes, M.A., Chaplain to Exeter Grammar School.
Dingle, Rev. Arthur Trehane, M.A., Rector of Hetton-le-Hole, Durham.
Ditchfield, Rev. P. H., M.A., Rector of Barkham; Organising Secretary for S.P.G. for the Archdeaconry of Berks, Oxford Diocese.
Gotto, Rev. E. R., M.A., Rector of Bridford; Vicar of Braunton, Devonshire.
Hipwell, Rev. James, M.A., late Curate-in-Charge of Woolpit; Vicar of Leavenheath, Colchester.
Lewis, Rev. Henry Thomas, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Horley, Surrey.
Lloyd, Rev. Rossendale, B.A., Curate of Brecon; Rector of Selattyn, near Oswestry.
Rawes, Rev. Francis Russell, M.A., Rector of Bradford, Devonshire.
Smith, Rev. George, Chaplain to the Forces, Shorncliffe; Chaplain to the Forces, Woolwich.
Stanton, Rev. W. R., Head Master of the Wisbech Grammar school; Rector of West Deeping, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bulmer, Rev. William Henry Philip, late Rector of Boldon, (Durham), at 43 Princess-street, Doncaster, on the 1st. inst., aged 87.
Buttemar, Rev. R. Durand, M.A., formerly Rector of Easton, Winchester, at his residence, Ashdene, Millbrook, Southampton, on the 27th ult., aged 79.
Carter, Rev. George, late Rector of Compton Beauchamp, at The Ferns, Torquay, on the 2nd inst., aged 77.
Falwasser, Rev. John Frederick, Vicar of Privett, on the 6th inst.,
Hall, Rev. Thomas Kenrick, formerly Vicar of Whatton-in-the-Vale, lost in the s.s. *Quetta*, on the 28th ult., aged 42.
Kewely, Rev. Francis, Rector of Remenham, at the Vicarage, Wingham, aged 62.
Landon, Rev. James Timothy Bainbridge, late Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Canon of York, at Ledsham Vicarage, on the 7th inst., aged 72.
Seawell, Rev. Frederick Yorke, on the 4th inst., aged 24.

The Church of England Pulpit.

REPENTANCE, CONFESSION, ABSOLUTION.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester, late Vicar of Penwortham.

"I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."—Psalm xxxii. 5.

THIS text speaks, and my discourse to-day will chiefly treat, of one of the fruits of true repentance—a fruit, which is certain to be produced, wherever the repentance is real and sincere, a fruit, which, if itself be a deep and true unburdening of the heart, leads at once to forgiveness and peace of mind—confession.

But we must, ere we enter upon this branch of our subject, begin, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by laying first the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God. For confession is the utterance of a heart repenting under the eye of God.

Repentance flows from sorrow—sorrow for sin. According to a well-known text, it is godly sorrow that worketh it. If the Holy Spirit be the father of true repentance, sorrow may well be called its mother.

And that sorrow must be real and enduring—real, as is the sorrow of the miser for his stolen hoard, or of the proud man for his lost honour, or of the loving heart for that desire of the eyes, which death has snatched away—and enduring—not consisting of a sigh that soon is hushed, or of a tear that is in a moment dry, or of a pang of the heart which easily finds an opiate in the care or enjoyment of other things, but continuing, until the sin has been mastered, which awoke the sorrow and the shame.

Sorrow is thus the worker of repentance; but only if the sorrow be a godly one. A sorrow of this world will not suffice, for that only worketh death. It is not enough to grieve, because, through sin, we have wasted our worldly substance, or impaired our health, or tarnished our good name, or rendered ourselves liable to punishment or penance, or disgusted our better friends, or incurred worldly damage or suffering of any other kind. The sorrow must be entirely on account of God, because our sin has provoked that Almighty Being, who has an endless treasure of punishments; or, better far, because sin is ingratitude to that merciful Being who has daily loaded us with benefits, and has still an unfathomable reserve of love for us; and against that Lord and Brother who has loved us and given Himself for us.

Such godly sorrow leads to repentance—*leads* to it only; but *is* it not. Repentance itself is not the sorrow, but the change. It is the turning of the heart from sin and sinful ways, from the world and worldliness, and, most of all, from self and selfishness, to God, through Christ, to win His merciful forgiveness; willing passively to submit to, and actively to do, His blessed and holy will; thus seeking at once pardon and holiness.

This is repentance. We may hear it called by many other names. Some call it a conversion, restoring to a sin-stained adult the spirit of a little child. Some name it a regeneration, a new birth, a birth from above, as a beginning of a new life, a rising from the death in trespasses and sins. Some speak of it as a new creation of a new man, that is being created in Christ Jesus, unto righteousness and true holiness. If the thing exists, we will not contend about the phrase. Let us seek it, any of us who fears he has not found it. Let us strive to increase and deepen it, any of us who trusts that he possesses its beginnings. Too much of the old Adam clings to and corrupts the new man in Christ Jesus; nor is there amongst us all one just person who needs no repentance.

It was said at the beginning, that if the repentance is sincere, confession is sure to follow. My text, and the Psalm in which it is contained, speak of this spiritual action, of the inward pain that called it forth, and of the relief which it gave. The Psalmist first describes himself, as he had once been, in the agonies of remorseful sorrow. "While I held my tongue"—refusing to confess—"my bones consumed away through my daily complaining; for Thy hand was heavy upon me day and night, and my moisture was like the drought in summer," His spirit was crushed, and his body dried, with the weary burden of conscious sin, and of God's displeasure.

Then the resolution to confess formed itself in his mind; "I will acknowledge my sin unto the Lord, and mine unrighteousness will I not hide. I said, I will confess my sins unto the Lord."

Confession having been made, relief came with all the rapidity of a charm: without a pause, without an interval, on the very moment, "Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." At once all shrinking from God disappeared. "Thou art a place to hide me in." The conscience with its stings, the memory with its reproaches, the face with its blushes, could plunge into the bosom of God, and there be hidden. Does not even human love hide the multitude of sins? And shall not the boundless love of God cover all that are confessed to Him; hiding the sinner from himself, and the sin from his God. Thenceforth, the whole strain is glad and trustful: "Thou shalt preserve me from trouble; Thou shalt compass me about with songs of deliverance"—the

whole air that he breathes full of such sounds of happy omen. And the heart, thus filled again with trust in God, can hear a promise of future guidance: "I will inform thee and teach thee in the way wherein thou shalt go; and I will guide thee with mine eye."

Confession is sometimes set forth in Scripture, as a necessary condition of forgiveness. It is so in that familiar text, with which we open so many of our services—"If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." But it is not demanded as an unwilling penalty or penance, elicited by threats, or wrung out of the heart by mental torture, and then accepted as a satisfaction for sins committed. Rather, it is prompted by the natural involuntary impulse of the heart repenting. The first thought of the Prodigal Son, when he came to himself in the far country, was to go to his Father, and to say, "Father, I have sinned." The penitents, who thronged the banks of Jordan to hear the preaching of John the Baptist, were constrained by no outward command, but pressed by an inward impulse, to confess their sins. The men of Ephesus, who repented of their magical impostures, came forward voluntarily to confess their sins. The publican at the Temple door expressed his own emotions, when he beat upon his own breast, and said, "God be merciful to me, the sinner." In each case the action was free, and proceeded straight out of the heart. It was the natural expression of the repentance that was already there.

But what is the object for which confession is demanded, and encouraged? It is not to instruct the Omniscient. The Psalmist who said, I will confess my sin unto the Lord, did not suppose that he conveyed to his Lord any knowledge that He did not possess before. As we say in one of our hymns, in language that is almost perfect in its extreme simplicity,

> We need not to confess our faults,
> For surely Thou can'st tell;
> What we have done, and what we are,
> Thou knowest very well.

The object is to place in conjunction in the mind two ideas, our sin, and God—sin, as it is, and God as He is. To be willingly conscious at the same moment of our own sin in all its exceeding sinfulness, and of God, the Great, the Holy, the Patient, the Merciful; and thus to bring the sin and lay it before Him, who has in His hands both the forgiveness and the cure—that is confession. To feel our own sin of deed, and word, and thought, as it has been in us, and is in us still; and to feel at the same time the light of God shining upon all that sin; to feel the eye of God searching us through and through; our whole character, and our whole memory, lying naked and open to the sight of Him with whom we have to do—to feel that inspection, and to consent to it, and to desire it; just as a sick man desires that the merciful eye of a good physician, whose only object is to cure him, should examine all his wounds, and pass over no symptom of his disease—to associate these two thoughts in the mind is the real and true confession. The more keenly and clearly they are present, the deeper will be the confession, and the more perfect the relief that will follow.

What are the benefits which proceed from such a confession? It brings to us self-knowledge. Nothing sharpens our insight into ourselves, and chases away self-deception, so much as the feeling that God is inspecting us, at the same time as we are inspecting ourselves. From self-knowledge proceeds humility. No one can be inwardly proud without hiding away in some secret fold of his heart, out of sight of his own consciousness, much of his own sinfulness, many of his own sins. From self-knowledge comes carefulness, without which an amended life is impossible. Lastly, confession brings that relief of which the Psalmist spoke. There is a reality in the old saying, that he, who confesses all his sins, makes a clean breast of it. The very act seems to discharge something out of the breast, which, like the matter out of an abscess, removes a weight and relieves a pain. It was thus that the publican, who went down to his house justified, and the Psalmist, who, after groaning under God's heavy hand, learnt to know the blessedness of him whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered, obtained their relief and peace.

All this is confession made to God; and all its reality and all its happy effects depend upon God's presence being realised, whenever the act is done. Our Father in heaven is our Father Confessor, and according to the command of His most dearly-beloved Son, who has led us back to Him, we call no man our father upon earth except only Him. He, the one true Author of our being, is the nearest, the readiest, the most compassionate, the most fatherly. As our Saviour said: "I say not unto you that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father Himself loveth you." It is thus that in confession the wandering child finds his way back to his true Father and to his true home.

Thus far confession has been treated only as a duty owed to God, as a transaction between the individual soul and Him. But it is also, in some cases, a duty owed to man; and, as the confession of sins to God is followed by God's forgiveness, so the confession to man is followed by the absolution of man. We have to consider what this confession is, in what cases it is demanded or desired, and what is the nature, and what the effects, and what the limitations, and who the dispenser, of the absolution which follows it. And this ought to complete our subject, as far as it can be completed, within the limits of a discourse.

There are several cases in which confession is due from man to man. First, we owe one to our neighbour, if we have done wrong to him. When the consciousness of the wrong arises in us, we

ought to tell him that we have sinned. It is of this that St. James is speaking in his famous text, "Confess your faults one to another," and "Pray one for another that ye may be healed." It is a duty that is very seldom done. Even if the words rise to the lips, they are usually silenced there by pride. It is easy in our retirements to say to God, more or less formally: "Father, I have sinned against thee." But to go to a neighbour and to say: "Brother, I have behaved very ill to you"—that self-humiliation is a hard trial, which few can bear.

But if a person does win this victory over self, and humbles himself to confess his fault to his neighbour, then should follow, and usually will follow (for such frank self-humiliation is a very softening thing), his neighbour's absolution. The person offended will forgive the penitent his sin. And now consider what are the limits of this brotherly forgiveness. What sin can the injured man forgive to the repentant person who confesses to him? Only that which was committed against himself. When he was injured, God's law was also broken, and a sin committed against Him. But he, the injured brother, cannot forgive that sin; it is reserved for the higher court, for the Judge of the living and the dead at his appearance in His kingdom, for the Searcher of all hearts, who alone can correctly appreciate the crime or the sin. Yet, in this case, man's absolution carries with it an assurance and foretaste of that of God, for the forgiven person argues justly: If my brother, who is but a sinner, has forgiven me, how much more my heavenly Father, who is love.

When sin has been open to the world, the sinner owes a confession to the world. The world has seen the sin, and has been thereby injured and scandalised, and it has a right to know also of the repentance, which may be signified either by word or by silent action. Such a confession is the 51st Psalm, a sinner's humble acknowledgment of a notorious sin, in a writing published to the world. Such, also, is the record of Peter's denial, related in all four Gospels, one of which may have been compiled under his own eye. And the world has its absolutions. We sometimes hear of the absolution of society, when it remits its censures and relieves from its excommunications. But society is very capricious and often very unjust, both in its ban and in its blessing. There are sinners hopelessly excluded from its sanctuaries whom the Father of Mercies has already taken back to his heart. And there are others, quite as grievous, who are admitted everywhere. The absolution of society is very far indeed from coinciding with, or assuring us of, the forgiveness of God.

Lastly, confession is owed to the Church of those sins which are committed against the Church. What are these? In one point of view all sins are offences against the Christian community and brotherhood. The whole object of that body's existence is to promote holiness, and a good life is the one indispensable condition of her membership. A bad life is a breach of that condition, and a grievous injury to the Church herself, because it hinders her great work of presenting to the world a living example of her Master's holiness and truth. For this reason the sins of Christians are punishable by Church censures, of which the chief, and almost the only one, is exclusion from Communion. The person so excluded is bound to reconcile himself by repentance and confession. When he repents and acknowledges his sin, the community is bound to forgive him, and to comfort him, lest he should be swallowed up with over much sorrow. It must open its arms and welcome the repentant brother to outward communion, and to inward sympathy.

It is the Church that is able and bound to do this—not an individual, like a priest in his confessional, or a bishop or pope upon his throne; not a hierarchy of officials judging a subject body; but the Church—the Ecclesia—the assembly or community of brethren, all of whom, as living members, have the right and the duty to take part, both in the censure and in the forgiveness.

Then the question arises, how far does this Church forgiveness extend? From what sins can it absolve? What penalties can it remit? And the answer to that question is very clear. The Church can only forgive those sins which have been committed against herself. She can only remit those punishments which she has herself imposed. She can only welcome back to her communion the sinner, whom she has herself excluded. She can go no further. The sinner, whom his brother has forgiven a personal offence, is received into friendly relations again; the one, whom society forgives a breach of her usages, enters again into her social circle; so the one whom the Church has forgiven takes his place at the Lord's Table again. That is the whole of her forgiveness, her absolution, her remission of sin—name it as you will. The remission of the sin against God remains beyond her power and beyond her understanding; it awaits the judgment of the Omniscient.

Yet the forgiveness of the Church is a consolation. As, in the former cases, the sinner could argue: If my brother, sinful and selfish though he be, has forgiven me, if society, hard and cruel as it is, has forgiven me, surely, God, who is love, must have forgiven me long before—so here one may say, if the Church, which, in spite of all the magniloquence of its partisans, is very full of faults—often worldly, often pharisaical and self-righteous, almost always intolerant, has freely forgiven me, surely, He, whose mercy surpasses all human measures, has forgiven me also. When even the Scribes and Pharisees have forgiven, has not the Lord written silently with His own finger His judgment on my case: Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more.

And now we come to the point, which is of most importance on account of the errors which have there arisen, and the momentous consequences of those errors. A confusion exists in men's minds between the Church's remission of sins against herself, and her declaration of God's forgiveness of the sins committed against Him. And this confusion has been permitted and encouraged by the clergy of almost all ages, and is so now. They like to be supposed to possess higher powers than the mere administration of Church sentences and reprieves. They would fain be thought to have at least a share in God's judgments upon His own penitents, and to exercise in part a function which is most essentially His own. But a pretension to issue to individuals God's sentences of forgiveness of the sins committed against Him is both irrational and profane. Irrational, indeed! For consider what qualifications are required in order to pronounce a perfectly just sentence on the case of any man. The judge must possess a perfect knowledge of the whole external history of a penitent's life, of the whole internal history of his soul, of the force of his hereditary predispositions, and the circumstances under which he has had to live, and of the character which has been formed in him under all the influences to which he has been subjected. Can a priest acquire all this knowledge in ten minutes in a confessional?

And is any priest or minister morally qualified to judge in the place of God? Go to a clerical convocation, or a Lambeth conference, or a Vatican council, where are assembled the most distinguished persons, who arrogate to themselves this supernatural power, and there listen to the words and mark the characters. Are these men fit to represent the Deity? Do you observe, in them all, deep spiritual insight, calm judicial impartiality—I will not say equal to that of God, but even such as has been sometimes attained by man. Instead of these you find prejudice, party spirit, self display, worldly aims, readiness, even in the higher class of minds, to sacrifice simple truth of conscience to the interests of the community, or even to the exigencies of their own career. These are the very *élite* of the professed guides of souls, and amongst them some are to be found, who, if by clear insight into human motives, by profound study of casuistry, and by complete ascetic detachment from all secular aims, any human being could be qualified to act for God, might be able to remit or retain men's sins committed against Him. And, if it be presumption in such as these to pronounce God's judgments on individual souls, what must be said of the persons who assume a superhuman function, without any qualification for their impossible task—of the illiterate narrow-minded priest, of the curate who has just, and hardly, passed his final examination, of the persons, too numerous in every religious community, who have sought a priest's office that they may eat a morsel of bread?

Has God delegated to men like these His own function of speaking peace or condemnation to human souls? And if this pretension be irrational, how unspeakably profane? That men should pretend to exercise the most inalienable prerogative of the Deity, should judge all men before the time, and anticipate by a fallible human sentence that appraisement which our lives and our characters await at the hand of God. Let every truthful man in the ranks of the ministry put clear away from him all share in this unreasonableness, this charlatanism, this profanity.

Thus, a man may remit or retain Church censures, for the penalty is earthly only, and an appeal lies from his decision to the higher court of God. But none can pass sentence on sin as it lies between man and his God, none can remit it, none retain it; none can appreciate at its true value a human life or character, and, therefore, none can pronounce an individual forgiven or unforgiven, except Him, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid. It is of man's pretended judgments in the supreme court of God that Paul says, "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self . . . He that judgeth me is the Lord." The earthly tribunal is incompetent; the evidence before it is incomplete. Let the case stand over just for this little while, until each of us stands (how gladly and how thankfully!) in the presence of perfect Wisdom, Power, and Love.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.—IV.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington, Hants.

A Course of Sermons preached in Lymington Church during Lent.

"Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."—St. Matt. iv. 5-7.

I CALL your attention again to the consideration of that subject which has engaged our thoughts with deep interest—the temptation of our Lord Jesus Christ by the devil. The subject indeed is the same, but the *scene* is different. We left Him in the wilderness; we are now to follow Him to the "Holy City." Satan knows how to shift the scene of his temptations as to adapt them to the circumstances of the tempted. All places are open to him, the wilderness, the city, or the Temple of God—all are places visited by the wicked one. And here we have to follow the blessed Saviour from the wilderness to the Temple and climb our ascending way to

the lofty "pinnacle of the temple," and there gaze upon a scene of stupendous interest, the Saviour of the world meeting the fierce temptations of the devil on "a pinnacle of the temple." Draw near, my brethren, in a spirit of earnest prayer, for truly this is a temptation in which the people of God are specially concerned.

Now, let us consider first the nature and circumstances of the temptation before us. St. Matthew, you will observe, mentions this as the second in order of the three temptations, whereas St. Luke gives it as the third, and upon this and such like discrepancies some have made objections to the truth of God's Word; but there is no foundation for any objection of the kind, rather indeed the contrary, as it shows that each of the sacred writers gives us a history of the life of Christ independent of the other. The object of St. Luke was simply to give a statement of the three temptations of Christ without special reference to the order of time, connecting each of them with the word "and;" whereas St. Matthew appears to follow the order in which they took place, introducing the temptation before us with the word "then." "Then the devil taketh Him up into the Holy City, and setteth Him on a pinnacle of the Temple." Now, in answer to the question *how* the devil took the blessed Jesus to the Holy City, there are some who think that the devil conveyed Him away in a miraculous manner, carrying Him from the wilderness to the city as an eagle would her prey. With this view of the matter I cannot agree. I do not believe that the devil was permitted to lay a hand on the holy person of Christ, or in any way to constrain Him against His will. He could not touch the person of Job without God's special permission; nor did he attempt to use any violence with Jesus when they stood together on the pinnacle of the Temple. That indeed was not his object. His object was to gain a compliance with the will of Jesus to his will, and thus lead Him into sin. No, by the phrase "the devil taketh Him up into the Holy City," we are simply to understand he conducted Him thither. It is the same expression that is used where it said that "Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John to the mount of transfiguration," that is, conducted them to the Mount. We may suppose Satan, defeated in the wilderness, challenged the blessed Saviour to meet him in the Temple, implying, perhaps, with a sarcastic sneer, that His God, though the God of the wilderness, was not the God of the City; and that Jesus, led as He was all through His temptations by the spirit of God, accepted the challenge of the devil, and accompanied him to the Holy City, where we are told that "the devil setteth Him on a pinnacle of the Temple," by which we are not, I think, to understand the sharp point of some lofty spire, but rather one of those lofty porches that were at the east end of the Temple, perhaps that built by Herod, on the top of which Josephus says, "There was a gallery of such vast height that if any looked down he would grow dizzy, his eyes not being able to reach to the vast depth below;" and there standing on this pinnacle of the Temple, which commanded a view of the Holy City beneath, the devil addressed Him in those words: "If Thou be the Son of God, cast Thyself down." Now in making this proposal be it observed that the devil would be aided by the circumstances of the place on which the Saviour stood. Standing on the lofty pinnacle of the Temple, looking down on the stupendous depth below, there is a well-known natural tendency—in some minds almost irresistible—to throw oneself from the dizzy height into the depth below. Taking advantage of this weakness in our physical nature, the devil addressed the blessed Jesus in those words, "Cast Thyself down."

And here we may reverently ask what was the *inward principle in the Saviour's mind* to which the devil appealed in making this proposal? There must have been in this, as in every other temptation, some strong and inward principle to which the devil appealed, upon which he rested the strength of his temptation. In the former temptation it was the hungry state of the Saviour's Body which lent its aid to the proposal of the devil—"Command these stones that they be made bread." But what was the principle which gave force to this temptation, "Cast Thyself down?" It certainly was to no sinful principle in the Saviour's mind that the devil appealed, for "in Him was no sin." It is the opinion of the learned Dean Bagot that the principle to which the devil appealed was the strong desire in the Saviour's mind to get rid of the devil Himself. Standing on the pinnacle of the Temple in close contact with the devil, the pure and holy mind of the blessed Jesus would shrink with an instinctive horror from the near presence and hateful temptations of the wicked one, for although He submitted, for our sakes, to be tempted of the devil, yet such was the agony of His soul, that "with strong crying and tears" He gave expression to His feeling; and yet here He stood on the pinnacle of the Temple with the devil, and no means of escape open to Him. Taking advantage of this state of mind, which would be strong in proportion to the purity of the Saviour's soul, we may suppose that the devil addressed Him thus: "If Thou be the Son of God, why submit to the torment of my presence? why stand here to listen to the foul and insulting language with which I address Thee? Quit my presence, cast Thyself down from hence." If this was the principle on which the devil rested the strength of his temptation, he certainly had a strong feeling in the mind of the Holy Jesus to which he appealed.

But I rather think that the principle to which the devil appealed may have been this: If Thou be the Son of God *prove* it; you are placed here by me on this pinnacle of the Temple, the Holy

City is below, a vast throng of people are gazing upward, they are but waiting for some manifestation of power. If, then, Thou be the Son of God, I challenge Thee to the proof, cast Thyself down, declare Thyself to be the Son of God with power, and Thou shalt then be received with the plaudits of an admiring throng, who will cry out, "Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel."

To lend force to this temptation, the devil seeing the reverence in the Saviour's mind for the Word of God, turns to the Scripture, and quoting from the 91st Psalm, which he knew to be a prophetic psalm applicable to the Saviour, he says, Cast Thyself down, for "it is written, He shall give His angels charge concerning Thee, and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest at any time Thou dash Thy foot against a stone"—a passage of Scripture most skilfully selected, and one well calculated to lend force to this temptation; but he artfully omits in his quotation the words "*in all Thy ways*," "to keep Thee in all Thy ways," and quotes it as a general promise of God's protecting care, without respect to ways or circumstances. Now, had the Saviour yielded to this temptation, He would have been departing from the way in which He was led by the Spirit of God, cleaving out a path for Himself, throwing Himself unbidden on the miraculous care of God's power, proving Himself to be the Son of God by an act of presumption, without reference to the voice from heaven which had declared Him to be the beloved Son in whom the Father was well pleased. He would have been "taken in the snare of the devil," and thus the whole work of man's redemption would have been ruined; but, thank God, in this temptation also Satan failed. "He found nothing in Jesus."

II. But now turning from the consideration of Christ Himself to that *of His people*, let us inquire whether there is anything in the experience of Christ's people analogous to this special temptation of their Redeemer? I think the history of the people of God will lead us to see that there is. And here be it observed that, as in the case of Christ Himself, so Satan in dealing with His people does not hesitate to use the Temple of God, nay, the word of God itself, as the means of leading them into temptation. Led by the Spirit of God into the Temple, and to the study of God's Word, be it remembered that Satan is there too. There he endeavours to bring them up as it were to a pinnacle of the Temple, and by the perversion of some passage of Scripture to lead them to look down upon the Temple and its services, the people of God and the Holy City itself. Standing on this pinnacle there is great danger of spiritual pride, till in such a frame of mind the man fancies that he is carried with Paul into the third heavens, where he hears unspeakable things, till he is independent of the written word, and begins to look with a feeling of supercilious contempt—as did the Pharisee of old—on his fellow-worshippers in the temple beneath, till he is ready to listen to the suggestion of the devil: "Cast Thyself down." "for a haughty spirit goeth before a fall." Thus one, taking the doctrine of election, and handling the Word of God deceitfully, is led to reason with himself: "I am elected, the Spirit of God witnesseth with my spirit that I am; therefore I am sure of salvation, the decree has gone forth and cannot be altered." And instead of having his mind filled with "sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort," he is in danger, in such a state of being "thrust down by the devil into desperation, or into wretchedness of unclean living no less perilous than desperation."

Or another feels, "I am a child of God"; and then the devil whispers in his ear: "If Thou be a son of God, prove it to the satisfaction of thy fellow-Christians." And in this state he is led to speak of spiritual truths he does not comprehend, or to tell of experiences, till he is led away by Satan from the simplicity that is in Christ to the fanatical utterances of things that are unscriptural and unreal.

Or another is led to feel, "As a child of God I cannot sin"; for St. John tells us that "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." In this state of mind he is led to neglect the plain command of Scripture: "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation"; and unless the Lord stretch forth His hand to save him, as He did Peter in answer to his cry, "Lord, save me and perish," he will soon be lost in the deep waters, or sink into the horrible pit and miry clay of sin. Thus does Satan make use of the Temple of God and the Word of God as means of overthrowing the faith of some and leading them into sin. And indeed it is a striking fact that most of the heresies that have distracted the Church of God have arisen out of the Church itself by the misapplication or perversion of passages of God's Word. Alas, that some even amongst the clergy of our own beloved Church, men otherwise earnest and devout, have been tempted so to elevate ritual and to introduce practices foreign to the services of the Church of our land, that they have distracted the minds of many, perverted the faith of some, and when corrected have refused to yield obedience to "the godly admonitions of those who are set over them in the Lord." Beware, my brethren, in spiritual matters of setting up your own judgment about the written Word of God, or in any way evading or taking otherwise than in their plain and natural sense the laws and Articles of our Church, lest Satan get an advantage over you, for "we are not ignorant of his devices."

III. And now let us mark *the manner in which* the blessed Saviour met this temptation of the wicked one. It was again, by an appeal to the Word of God, which is "the Sword of the Spirit."

Though Satan has misapplied Scripture, the Saviour still uses it as His weapon of defence. And in this, as in every other respect, He is an example to us. Let us not be drawn aside from the proper use of God's Word because some handle it deceitfully. Like the sword of Goliath there is no weapon like it "quick and powerful." The particular passage quoted by the Saviour is taken again from the Book of Deuteronomy, 6th chapter, and 16th verse: "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted Him in Massah." By which the Saviour means to say that had He yielded to the suggestion of the devil to "cast Himself down," He would have been departing from the path of duty, throwing Himself unbidden into danger; and then, expecting the power of God to protect Him in that danger, He would be "tempting the Lord His God." How appropriate the passage, how powerful the answer! What an example, what a lesson of instruction, have we here as to the use of God's Word in the hour of temptation!

Beware, my brethren, of *spiritual heights* in religious matters. Beware lest Satan set you on some pinnacle of the Temple of God, lifting you up with spiritual pride, till you are tempted to look down upon the ordinances of religion as beneath your feet, to forsake the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is, to neglect God's Word, till, ceasing to watch and pray, in an evil and unguarded hour you are taken in the snare of the devil. Well may we pray, in the language of the Litany: "From pride, vain glory, and hypocrisy, good Lord deliver us."

But remember for your *encouragement* Jesus met and overcame the devil on the pinnacle of the Temple; keep close to Him and you are safe. Sit, like Mary of old, at His feet. Be meek and lowly in spirit, as He was. The lily of the valley escapes the storm, while the mountain ash is torn from its roots. Though the Lord be high, yet hath He respect unto the lowly. Lean upon the promises of God's Word; use it as the staff of your pilgrimage, and your sword in the day of battle. Then "no weapon that is formed against you shall prosper." Jesus will keep you so that you shall be able to stand in the evil day, and having done all to stand. For thus has He taught us to pray: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil (or the evil one), for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen."

THE congregation of St. Barnabas's, Pendleton, have succeeded in raising £1,000 in aid of an endowment fund, and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have decided to meet this sum with a grant of £1,000, an endowment of £60 a year being thus provided.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noses in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1890.

THE PRUDENTIAL ASSURANCE COMPANY.

IN former years we have drawn attention to the fact that this commercial Company is a great and successful missionary society for the practical education of the industrial or wage-earning classes in thrift and Life Insurance. This being so, we think it right to bring to the notice of the clergy and others, interested in the welfare of the poor, the progress of this mission. Astonishing and gratifying as have been previous returns, the report and accounts for 1889, as given in our advertisement pages, present features demonstrating the marvellous progress of the institution—features which are eminently satisfactory because of the evidence they give of good work done in inculcating providence and thrift where it is most needed. In the rapidity of its growth the *Prudential* has for years past been a long way ahead of all other Insurance offices in this country, and now, for the first time in its history, it can claim the proud distinction, whether as an Industrial or an Ordinary Company, of being the largest British institution of its kind. Its business is drawn exclusively from the United Kingdom, and the present report treats of new assurances completed in the past year in the Ordinary Branch alone, yielding an annual income exceeding £250,000,—nothing seems capable of stopping or even checking its growth. An insurance on either the Ordinary or Industrial plan is beyond all question better than no insurance at all, and, as we have before had occasion to remark, an organisation which has induced the effecting of insurances on the lives of between eight and nine millions of people has indeed the right to be regarded as a most

beneficent national institution. It is evident that, *pari passu* with the enormous progress in the business done, the benefits accruing to the assured under the Company's policies have undergone steady and continuous improvement. The industrial policy-holders now share to an appreciable extent in the success achieved by the Institution; and in the liberal and considerate conditions attaching to these policies the management affords proof, practical and conclusive, of its desire to give the wage-earning classes every advantage that experience suggests and safety permits. Obviously the object is not only to attract and promote business, but to facilitate and encourage its maintenance when acquired; this is the real explanation of the continuously increasing returns. We learn from the report submitted at the forty-first annual meeting that the number of policies issued in the Ordinary department during the year ending December 31st last was 43,792, assuring £4,433,834, and producing a new annual premium income of £253,483. The total premium income of the ordinary branch for the year was £904,915, being an increase of £186,067 over the year 1888. This return in premiums is larger than that of any other British Insurance office. It is beyond question that a continually increasing proportion of the insurers in the Ordinary branch are persons who, in earlier times, would have been content with Industrial policies. The alternative of either branch is always offered to the public, and we are glad to say that many persons see the advantage of paying their premiums annually, half-yearly, or quarterly. This fact shows that the *Prudential*, although purely a commercial undertaking conducted on commercial principles, has educated the industrial classes in the matter of thrift and insurance. The following summary of results further illustrates the extraordinary growth and development of the Company's Ordinary business during recent years :—

Year.	Number of New Policies Issued.	Sums Assured Thereby.	New Annual Premiums.	Total Premium Income.
1883	9,504	£1,166,392	£46,959	£200,790
1886	25,567	2,715,429	125,604	396,940
1889	43,792	4,433,834	253,483	904,915

This business is conducted at the extremely small expense of 10 per cent., whereas the British Office, doing the next largest new business, expends on management nearly 24 per cent. of its premiums, while the huge American offices, with which the *Prudential* can more properly be compared, show a ratio of over 20 per cent.

But it is the Industrial branch which gives the truest indication of the educational, moral and physical condition of the English poor. The figures contained in this report are considerably in excess of all previous returns. The premiums actually received in the past twelve months reached the sum of £3,336,742 being £80,396 in excess of the total for 1888. The average receipts per week for 1887 were £58,817, for 1888 £61,440, and for 1889 £64,168. The sum paid out in respect of 150,557 deaths amounted to £1,285,409 during the year, and we are told that since the formation of the Company a sum approaching 13 millions sterling has been paid in satisfaction of claims under Industrial policies. The following are the main results of the Industrial business during the past five years.

	Total Premiums Received.	Claims.	Life Fund.
1885	£2,794,522	£1,069,878	£4,034,445
1887	3,058,561	1,204,823	5,499,827
1889	3,336,742	1,285,000	7,149,205

We are glad to learn that upwards of 45,000 free policies were granted during the year to those policy-holders of five years' standing who desired to discontinue their weekly payments. This is a privilege granted to those who find it inconvenient to keep up their payments. The total number of policies in force at the end of the year was over 8½ millions; and although there were half-a-million more policies in force in 1889 than in 1888, the number of those which ceased to be paid upon in the past twelve months was actually less than in the preceding year. This fact is a sure sign that last year was a prosperous one for the country, and that the confidence of the people in the *Prudential* increases year by year. Out of the year's revenue the Company has put by more than a million and a-half of money to meet future liabilities. The total assets of the undertaking now amount to £10,946,156, and so far as the care and investment of these large reserves are concerned, there is every reason for the fullest and most complete confidence.

The contemplation of this great success in the Life Insurance of the labouring classes causes us to regret that their primary education is not committed to a joint stock company; education affords a wide and virgin field for such enterprise, and if taken up by such an energetic man as the Rev. William Rogers, of St. Thomas's Charterhouse and Middle-class fame, we are sure that it would prove an enormous success. The politicians would be relieved of their foolish and immoral agitation for free education. During thirty-five years we have had daily experience and evidence that the British workman and labourer prefer a "pay" to a "charity" school, even though the latter gives free clothes and in some instances free board and lodgings into the bargain.

THE Rev. Peter Rivers de Jersey, M.A., vicar of Empshott, Hants, died on Friday week. Deceased, who was sixty-one years of age, graduated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1853, and was ordained the same year to the curacy of Moulsham, Essex; he also served curacies at St. Neot's and Doddington, Cambs. He was appointed vicar of Aslacton, Norfolk, in 1865 and vicar of Empshott in 1869.

Reviews and Notices.

"HIGH DAYS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH," &c. By the Very Rev. Andrew Tait, D.D., &c., Provost of Tuam. London: Griffith and Co., 1890.

THIS work is a credit to the Irish Church. It is full of practical lessons in religion. But it is more. It goes on true Catholic principles. It is Church, every line of it. We look to what it says of baptism. Nothing can be more sound. "Our spiritual life, whether given to us at first in our baptism, or renewed after repentance, is the gift of the Father of Spirits. . . . . It is only when we are made the children of God by adoption that we regain what was originally lost. It admits us into God's family; it makes us members of Christ and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven" (p. 88). Again, "In regeneration there is the formation of the new creature; in conversion there is the turning of the whole man, intellect, affection, and will towards God" (p. 89). Turning to the account of the Resurrection we meet no Romish fables about His body passing through the rock, but we are told that the stone had been rolled away to permit His exit, as was the case also with the bodies of the saints, for which the graves were opened. In the account of our Lord's appearing to His Apostles, when the doors were closed for safety, we meet no modern novelties about His body not being bound by laws like ours. Why may not the doors have been opened to admit Him? Though even if by a miracle he did pass through wall or door, this would no more prove that His body is any more free from the restrictions on other bodies, than His walking on the water proved the same as to His body before death. We meet with no strange theories to account for His forty days' delay of His Ascension. The book throughout is free from all novelties, either of the German school or of the Roman. With such a man, and other such like, in the diocese of Tuam, it would be strange indeed if the clergy would have to seek elsewhere for a successor to the Prelate whom they have lost, and whom they still deplore.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE ATONEMENT.

SIR,—In the second paragraph of Mr. Murphy's letter occur these words, "This is saying"—viz., Final Restoration is incompatible with a belief in the Atonement—"that if I believe that the Son of God will ultimately be the Saviour of all the lost by the power of His Atonement, I cannot believe that He is the Saviour of any." I think that these words carry their own refutation with them. How could I say that he asserted that none would be saved, if he asserted that all would be so? This is not all. There are none lost, if all are saved. There is no need for any anxiety anywhere. "Christ has pledged Himself to make me happy. I am not lost. Why should I trouble?" This is the outcome of Mr. Murphy's view. I submit that it makes life very easy going; but it is not the teaching of the Word of God.

"God saves some in this life. He saves the mass after death." Mr. Murphy does not see here that, in such a case, God governs the world on two distinct and opposite principles. He differs in this matter from most of his *confrères*. They, to be consistent, are obliged to assert that men "*are pretty much alike*." I must take the liberty of observing that I cannot understand the constitution of Mr. Murphy's mind. I must leave him to settle the inconsistency as he best can.

"Now," continues Mr. Murphy, "He who came to seek and to save the lost is the Lord of the dead as well as of the living, and yet Mr. Sandlands maintains that He would be acting inconsistently if He did not, at the entrance of the tomb, cease His pursuit after those He came to save." The Saviour says that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This is a direct contradiction and it is not mine. I do not judge the Saviour. Who am I, that I should say, "What doest thou?" What I say is, that the Bible nowhere leads us to hope that the Saviour will do anything for the lost in the other world. I cannot understand how it is that Mr. Murphy does not see that the hypothesis is self-contradictory. How can there be any lost, if they are all saved? If Mr. Murphy's views be right, then it will follow that many words in the Bible have no meaning whatever, and that many others must have their meaning either eliminated or modified.

I do not wish to leave anything unnoticed in Mr. Murphy's letter, and so, notwithstanding the length of mine already, I must ask permission to notice his last paragraph. In it he says, "When it is maintained that God has made mere bodily death a barrier impassable to Himself . . . it must be met with argument." This is not to put the case fairly. God sets no bounds to His power. That point, however, is not in question. The question is, "Whether man has power or not to accept God's offer of mercy?" This does not admit of argument. Men do reject God's offer of mercy. We have no reason, positive or otherwise, for supposing that by any manner of means they will accept the offers of mercy in a future life. And then Mr. Murphy continues: "But when it is maintained that such limitation is needed by the character of God as revealed in Christ's Atonement, it needs only to be stated in order to see its absurdity." I do not know if Mr. Murphy means this as serious reasoning. I suppose he does. What then is the character of God? Infinitely just. Infinitely merciful. His justice demands satisfaction. His mercy provides the Atonement. Men care for none of these things. God forces His mercy on them whether they will or not! And this is the outcome! It seems to me that the mere statement of it should make men fear and tremble.

J. P. SANDLANDS.

Brigstock Vicarage, March 15th, 1890.

SIR,—I say it is contrary to fact or experience that belief of the Atonement, or of any doctrine at all, leads to a holy life. What leads to that is faith—faith in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. By this the Christian has life. Our Saviour always tells us, and His Apostles tell us, that the object of faith is the Personal God. The prophets and patriarchs teach the same. Faith in Him makes men righteous, Belief of no doctrine will make men righteous. This is that justification by faith which St. Paul, of all writers inspired and secular, teaches most fully.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

9th March, 1890.

THE PULPIT COMMENTARY ON REVELATION.

SIR,—Kindly allow me, through your columns, to correct the false impression inevitably created by the misleading title-page which the editor has given to this work. It states that the "Exposition" is "by Rev. A. Plummer, assisted by Rev. T. Randell and Rev. A. Bott," the truth being that I wrote the exposition of *less than three chapters* out of twenty-two, or scarcely one-eighth of the whole.

I was engaged to do the whole; but before I had finished the third chapter, I was allowed to transfer the work to the Rev. T. Randell, who, with Mr. Bott's help, has finished it; and it is obviously very unjust to him to describe him as a mere assistant. That word describes me.

I have been reading a review of the volume in the *Scotsman*, in which I receive a considerable amount of praise for work, not one syllable of which is mine. This is as painful to me as it is unfair to Mr. Randell.

I have written to both the editor and the publishers of the volume, as well as to the *Scotsman;* but I should be grateful if you would grant me your assistance in setting the matter right.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, March 5th, 1890.

DR. LITTLEDALE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—The doctrine of Transubstantiation originated in the ninth century, and was reduced to exact logical statement in the thirteenth century, at the Lateran Council. The doctrine could never have been reduced to such statement without the prevalence in those times of the realistic theories and terminology. The realistic philosophers held that matter consists not only of its qualities—ponderability, extension, colour, etc.—but that under these qualities there is a *tertium quid* that supports them, which was called *substance.* This theory was pressed into use by the advocates of the new doctrine—new at that time—of the reality or materiality of the change made in the sacred elements of the Eucharistic sacrifice at consecration. The *substance* of the elements, it was taught, and dogmatically pronounced at the Lateran Council, was changed into the substance of the material Body of Christ the Lord; while the accidents of the Bread and Wine remained as they always had been. *Accident* means quality—weight, size, strength, etc.

So long as people believed that there is such a thing as *substance* underlying and supporting the accidents or particular qualities of material things, it is evident that the Transubstantiation doctrine is no contradiction to the common sense of mankind. Men see that the holy elements do not, at consecration, change their qualities; they still retain them. But men do not see whether or not the *substance*, which is beyond the cognition of their perceptions, is changed. If they believe that there is such a thing as this substance, the Transubstantiation doctrine, though it cannot be proved, cannot be disproved directly.

During the whole of the Middle Ages there was a sect of philosophers, at one time, previous to the decision of the Lateran Council, numerous and influential, who disputed the existence of this supposed *substance.* After that decision they expired as a sect, through dread of persecution. But their idea never expired; and against the time of the Council of Trent it had very considerable sway even amongst the orthodox of the Romanists, although these Nominalists habitually employed the Realistic terminology. The Tridentine definition of the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist did not accordingly differ from the Lateran definition of three centuries before. But in the Romish literature, and even in that part of it which had the highest sanction, that is, some of their catechisms, language about the Eucharistic elements was introduced which imports an entirely new conception. It began to be taught that the elements are changed at consecration into the very flesh and blood of our Lord, which are presented to the faithful *under the species* of bread and wine. This was first laid down in Latin; but *species*, which is *appearance*, was brought in Latin into all the languages into which their catechisms were translated, and was preserved in their theological literature. Explained, this new doctrine is, that not only the *substance*, but also the very qualities or accidents, of the bread and wine are changed, while the appearance of that bread and wine remains. With all this the use of the old term *substance* was never given up. It came, however, to be the habit of Romanist expositors constantly to represent that after consecration nothing whatever of the original elements exists, while their *appearances* or *phantasms* are still visible. As the notion or belief in the *substance* of the Middle Ages died out—died out, however, pretty hard—the new exposition prevailed more and more.

About a hundred and fifty years ago the mediæval notion of this supposed *substance* received its crushing blow, from which it has never recovered, and never can recover, from Berkeley. At the present time it is safe to say that no man, fit to be out of an asylum, thinks that this substance had ever any existence except in the confused brains of some men of the darkest period of European intellectual development. The practical effect of this on the view of doctrine taken by Romanists has been that, although they retain the old language, they really mean nothing by it; and, at the same time, the use of the post-Tridentine language about *species*, which, in the modern languages of Europe, is utterly unmeaning, has been to a great extent dropped. Transubstantiation, as a living belief, has disappeared; being replaced by a superstitious regard towards the holy elements of the Mass, as if God were present in them after some unexplained and unexplainabie physical manner, or being replaced, among the vulgar, by the notion that a physical change takes place at consecration.

It is the traditional habit of the Roman *curia*, and of the professedly orthodox theologians of that communion, to abstain from ever formally admitting that they make or suffer a change of doctrine. They say that when language and terms are changed they are changed only in the nature of interpretation; and that the body of what they call Catholic truth has always been, even in its items, the same. Accordingly when the late Dr. Littledale spoke, in his most able tract, "Words for Truth," of the virtual abandonment of Transubstantiation by Romanists, a thing easily recognised by any who choose to study the history of the subject, it was mere matter of course that Romanists should contradict him. The real difference between them and Protestants, on the subject of the Eucharist, is that the former believe the Real Presence materially and superstitiously, and the latter believe it spiritually. There is also the further difference as to the purport of the Sacrament,

that we believe it to be a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and not, as Romanists imagine, a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead.

With regard to the terms employed by Dr. Littledale he points out the cessation of the habit of Romish theologians of describing the change in the elements as leaving nothing but phantasms or appearances, which doctrine never had as formal sanction as the Transubstantiation doctrine. Dr. Littledale does not confound *phantasm* and *accident* as Mr. Crosthwaite supposes : he distinguishes between them. He was a man indeed incapable of making such a mistake. The *Church Times* is a worthless authority on this ; the very words used in its reply to a correspondent show that the writer is utterly ignorant of the whole matter. Nor does Dr. Littledale misquote or misrepresent the Black Rubric as Mr. Crosthwaite thinks. He quotes it perfectly, correctly and makes no such ascription as that attributed to him. No one who understands the subject could imagine that he does.

B.

FREE EDUCATION.

SIR,—In your admirable article of the 15th instant, just to hand, I find the following question : "But what would be the result on the country at large if free education were brought about?" And, again, "Mr. Caine, in his 'Trip Round the World,' speaks in terms of praise of the Canadian system of free education," etc. Now, I object to the value of the evidence of men who get their information as they dash through space in railway cars, on the decks of steamers, and from interested parties already pledged to this or that system. Indeed, the Irish tourist is the laughing stock of all who have had the knowledge of experience in that country. I have seen, many a day, the inquisitive tourist, note-book in hand, make himself the victim of ingenious pleasantries on all sides, especially from the drivers of the "Irish jaunting car," and even from the donkey boys of Kilkee, both of which classes, to my own knowledge, regularly concoct stories to humour such inquiries, and, as they say themselves, "knock a fair sixpence out of the simpletons." I have seen much the same elsewhere. Though I have not made "a trip round the world," I know by experience, as a missionary priest in British Columbia for three years, the practical working of the so-called "free education," as contra-distinguished from the religious system ; and I now add a few items of matters of fact that came under my own personal knowledge in a dual-clerical work. First, the Education Act, in the province named, lays down the principle emphatically in the preamble that education must be exclusively secular, with no religious instruction on any pretences. I have not the Act at hand or I would quote the words of it : the sense I have given faithfully. Again, I have met with school teachers who were dismissed for the sin of teaching the Lord's prayer to the children. I could give the name of one in particular, a most respectable English Christian lady. Further, I have been specially consulted in a district under my spiritual charge, to examine a list of candidate teachers, as the most of them were professed Atheists, and the Christian people did not like such teachers nor their obtruded blasphemies to defile the consciences of their children, as the former teacher had done. Again, I have met with teachers who were professed unbelievers ; and one scoffed the idea of Moses coming down from the Mount "packing," as he said—(that is to say, carrying as a pack)—two huge inscribed tablets, like tombstones." Again, I have met children—one in particular, a very fine boy of twelve years old—who told me that he had never said a prayer in his life, and knew not what prayers meant. Not to intrude on your space unduly, I add only two items. The first is, that the children—boys of the longer-settled emigrants—have won for themselves the title of "Hoodloms," which means, Godless, graceless young reprobates, up to anything vile or outrageous, and out-doing "the Siwashes," or red-skins, in evil-doing. Indeed, some of these youths in Victoria constituted themselves into a thieving fraternity and broke into shops at night to plunder for *their* "*store*." These were brought before the Lord Chief Justice, whose manly and sensible comments were not in accord with Mr. Caine's re-echoed opinions. The last item is this, that it is largely due to the constant influx of Christianly-trained immigrants from the old Christian lands—especially from England, and of Irish Protestants too, that the knowledge of God and His worship are maintained, even under great difficulties in that vast province. "Ichabod" is written over any country which gives up Christian truth as the basis of education. It soon ceases to be the basis of law or of its administration. Politics soon become faction : the family is, ere long, debased, the fifth commandment being gone into abeyance. In a word, "They that forsake the Lord shall be desolate." How sad to see such a retrograde movement in a land which has had "the dooms" of Alfred the Great for centuries intermingling God's commandments with its laws, and which has seen, also, what came out of rejecting Christian truth in France, and leaving poor humanity to itself. Alas, it was the divisions and mutual jealousies of Christian sects which led to all this in our land and in Canada. And the same effects are likely to continue, while the same causes are still in operation. Until a better mind and some mutual forbearance among professing Christians come into action, the evil now rife is likely to run on its career towards ruin,—nor is this the only road open and trodden.

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.
Some time Missionary in British Columbia.
March 15th.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous ; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

THE Rev. George T. Palmer, rector of Newington and Rural Dean, was on Friday installed by Canon Burrows, during evensong, as an Honorary Canon in Rochester Cathedral.

THE *Durham County Advertiser*, referring to the nomination of the Rev. A. R. Tucker as Bishop-designate of Eastern Equatorial Africa, say :—"During his five years' work in Durham Mr. Tucker has laboured with a devotion and singleness of purpose which has evoked the admiration and appreciation of all classes ; and remembering his self-denying energy on behalf of young men especially, we employ no empty phrase in saying that his removal from Durham will be most keenly felt in the parish of St. Nicholas. There can be no doubt that Mr. Tucker will amply justify the choice, and prove a worthy successor to the great names which have preceded him." The *Record* says :—"Mr. Tucker is a staunch supporter and advocate of the temperance movement, and is also an enthusiastic lover of athletic sports. Some fifteen years since the Ambleside football team, which repeatedly proved its prowess when matched against some of the leading Lancashire teams, was never considered complete without him. The nerve and vigour and endurance which enabled him to perform the greatest walking feat on record in the Lake country—namely, a walk of sixty-four miles, including an ascent of the four highest mountains in England 12,000 feet of climbing), in one day—will doubtless avail him in the arduous journeys and amidst the dangers of the widespread diocese of Eastern Africa, extending as it does 700 miles inland from the diocesan seat of Freretown to the western shores of Lake Victoria.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arundel, Rev. W. R. H., M.A., Curate of Tottenham ; Rector of South Pool, Salcombe, Devonshire.

Boag, Rev. F., Organising Secretary of the S.P.G. for Nottinghamshire.

Brookes, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Hinckley, Northampton ; Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Northampton.

Camm, Rev. J. F., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Birkenhead ; Rector of St. George's-with-St. Paul's, Stamford.

Cherrington, Rev. A. O., Vicar of Ogley Hay ; Vicar of St. Margaret's, Birmingham.

Cobbold, Rev. Rowland Francis, M.A., Assistant-Master of the Grammar School, Macclesfield ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Crawford, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate of All Saints', Emscote ; Vicar of Clifton-on-Dunsmore, Warwickshire.

Dillon, Rev. C. F. A., Vicar of Enstone ; Rector of Peopleton, Worcestershire.

Evans, Rev. J. Owen, Vicar of Towyn, Merionethshire ; Rector of Peterstone, Cardiff.

Grix, Rev. William Bevern, M.A., Head Master of the Grammar School, Congleton ; Licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Harvey, Rev. E. D. L., M.A., late Curate of Croydon ; Rector of Downham Market, Norfolk.

Howe, Rev. John E., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of the Parish Church of Giggleswick.

Jones, Rev. Edmund Osborne, M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of St. Davids.

Lowe, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bolton ; Rector of St. John's, Cheetham.

Macdona, Rev. GeorgeVictor. B.A., Rector of Burmarsh, Kent.

McClintock, Rev. John S., M.A., Rector of Clonleigh ; Canon of Derry Cathedral.

Mantle, Rev. W., Vicar of St. Michael's, Devonport ; Diocesan Secretary to the Church of England Temperance Society.

Nash, Rev. H. Allden, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Birmingham ; Vicar of Ogley Hay, Walsall.

Oldfield, Rev. G. B., M.A., Rector of Berwick St. Leonard-cum-Sedgehill ; Additional Secretary to the Salisbury Diocesan Board of Education.

Onslow, Rev. A. L., Curate of St. James's, Brighton ; Vicar of Kingsbury, Tamworth.

Palmer, Rev. George Thomas, M.A., Rector of Newington and Rural Dean ; Honorary Canon in Rochester Cathedral.

Streeten, Rev. H. H., Association Secretary of the C.M.S. ; Vicar of St. John's, King's Lynn, Norfolk.

Tollemache, Rev. Algernon Edward, B.A., Rector of Quendon, Essex.

Turnock, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary-le-Tower, Ipswich ; Rector of Waltham, near Melton Mowbray.

Walker, Rev. F. R., Vicar of Christ Church, South Hackney.

Wardroper, Rev. A. S., Vicar of All Saints' ; Curate of Otterburn, in the parish of Elsdon.

Watts, Rev. J. P., Rector of St. Peter's, Thetford.

Webb, Rev. W. A., Vicar of Wall ; Vicar of Alrewas, Burton-on-Trent.

Wilkinson, Rev. C. G., M.A., Vicar of Waresley, Sandy ; Voluntary Inspector in Religious Knowledge for the Diocese of Ely.

Williams, Rev. John Bunce, B.A., Chaplain to the Devon County Lunatic Asylum.

Williams, Rev. John Hughes, M.A., Rector of Bittadon, Devonshire.

Wilson, Rev. P. E., M.A., Rector of All Saints', Birmingham ; Vicar of Packwood, Warwickshire.

Young, Rev. Vincent, M.A., late Curate of St. Mary's, Swansea ; Vicar of St. Gabriel's, Swansea.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ashworth, Rev. John Ashworth, at the Rectory, Didcot, on the 13th inst., aged 78.

Babb, Rev. George, M.A., Rector of Asterby, and Vicar of Callwell and Goulceby, Lincolnshire, at the Rectory, Asterby, on the 15th inst., aged 69.

Brette, Rev. P. H. Ernest, B.D., for twenty-six years Head Master of the French School in Christ's Hospital, late Examiner in the University of London, on the 16th inst., aged 58.

Butler, Rev. George, D.D., Canon of Winchester, in London, on the 14th inst., aged 70.

Davie, Rev. William Cufaude, M.A., Rector of Ashby-with-Oby and Thurne, at Oby Rectory, Norfolk, on the 12th inst.

De Jersey, Rev. P. Rivers, Vicar of Empshott, on the 7th inst.

Everett, Rev. Thomas Ellis, late Vicar of Theddingworth, Rugby, and formerly Vicar of Rockfield, Monmouthshire, at Newstead House, Hereford, on the 9th inst., aged 74.

Hopwood, Rev. F. G., Hon. Canon of Chester Cathedral, and for thirty-four years Rector of Winwick, at Winwick Hall, on the 11th inst., aged 79.

Hutchinson, Rev. John Henry, M.A., Curate of St. James's, Grimsby, at Great Grimsby, on the 11th inst., aged 31.

Langley, Rev. John Newton, M.A., L.L.D., formerly of Wolverhampton, at St. John's Vicarage, West Bromwich, on the 10th inst., aged 66.

Lee-Warner, Rev. Thomas Henry, at Highmoor Vicarage, Henley-on-Thames, on the 11th inst., aged 63.

Lewis, Rev. Michael, M.A., at one time Curate of Lutterworth, and afterwards of Cottesbach, at Lutterworth, on the 13th inst., aged 70.

Prance, Rev. Clement Howard, for nineteen years Vicar of Annesley, Notts, and recently appointed Vicar of St. John's, Derby, on the 15th inst., in his 49th year.

Sleap, Rev. Frederick, M.A., at Darfield Vicarage, on the 5th inst., aged 62.

Sparling, Rev. John, of Petton Park, on the 11th inst., aged 74.

Watts, Rev. Thomas William, Vicar of Bucklebury, and Rector of Marlstone, at Bucklebury Vicarage, Reading, on the 7th inst., aged 55.

White, Rev. John, M.A., for thirty-nine years Rector of the parish, at Grayingham, Lincolnshire, on the 15th inst., aged 71.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.—V.

By the Rev. B. MATURIN, M.A., Vicar of Lymington, Hants.

A Course of Sermons preached in Lymington Church during Lent.

"Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto Him, all these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve. Then the devil leaveth Him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him."—Matt. iv. 8—11.

WE are invited to the consideration of this the third and last of the temptations of the Blessed Saviour as mentioned by the Evangelist St. Matthew. The scene is again changed—we accompanied Him from the wilderness to the Holy City, and left Him on the pinnacle of the Temple, meeting and overcoming the strong temptation of the wicked one. But now we are to follow Him to the top of "an exceeding high mountain," and there gaze upon a spectacle which riveted the attention of heaven and hell. "The Prince of Peace" contending in battle with the "prince of the power of the air," till, the victory won, "the angels came and ministered unto Him." A more important subject never engaged the undivided attention of those who profess to be the soldiers and servants of Christ. Lift up your hearts in prayer, that the word may come home to your souls in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

Now in considering this third and last of the temptations recorded by the Evangelists I would observe that it appears to be the *strongest* of all the temptations by which the blessed Saviour was tried. There are some indeed who think otherwise, they think they can see a want of skill upon the part of Satan—in fact, that having become desperate, he in some measure forgot his cunning. I do not think so—let it be remembered that the forty days of temptation were now drawing to a close, and that as in those days "He did eat nothing," we can see that the human nature of Christ would now be exhausted, and that in every way His powers of resistance would be diminished. It was under such circumstances that the devil now came to Him, having great wrath, knowing that his time was short, and made this his last and great assault—if peradventure he might overcome the blessed Jesus in this the hour of His weakness, and thus destroy the work of man's salvation to be effected by the sinless offering of Himself upon the Cross of Calvary.

And is it not so in the experience of the soldiers of Jesus! that Satan's worst temptations are often made when the battle is almost ended and the Christian thinks that victory is secure. "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation." "In the hour of death and in the day of judgment, Good Lord deliver us."

Now in this as in each of the temptations, there were *outward circumstances* adapted to an *inward principle* to which Satan appealed, and upon which he based the strength of his temptation. The outward circumstances were these. "The devil, we are told, taketh Him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." What this mountain was we are not told; it is vain therefore to speculate. How he took Him is a question asked by many, but as we are not told otherwise, I should rather say that Jesus accompanied him of His own free will, and not by the constraint of the devil. Jesus "was led up of the Spirit to be tempted of the devil." He undertook to meet him. He accepted his challenge and met him on the field of battle selected by the devil, and now he "taketh Him to an exceeding high mountain, and showeth Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them." It may be asked, "Why did the devil take Him up to an exceeding high mountain"? as it is evident that from no mountain on earth, however high, could literally be seen all the kingdoms of the earth. He did so in order to give seeming reality to the delusion which he was about to practise, when on the extensive plain he drew a panoramic representation of the "kingdoms of the world and the glory of them"—all that was great, and grand, and noble, all that could fire the imagination, or kindle the enthusiasm or ambition of man—the glory of kings, their crowns, their palaces, their armies—all was made to pass, as in a vision, before the eye of the blessed Jesus; and *that* as St. Luke informs us "in a moment of time." The vision was but for a moment lest the delusion should be discovered, and that it might bewilder the mind, or dazzle the vision by its passing splendour. The *eye*, be it observed, was the sense through which Satan here sought to overcome the Saviour in this His great temptation. It was through the eye he had tempted and overcame our first parent. "When the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and pleasant to the eyes, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat;" and alas, is it not through the lust of the eye that he plunges thousands upon thousands at the present day into misery, sin and guilt? Oh, beware of Satan's temptation through the eye. "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee; better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast

into hell-fire, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

When Satan had made this gorgeous panorama of the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them to pass before the eye of the blessed Jesus, he thus addressed Him: "All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it. If Thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be Thine." (Luke iv. 6). Did Satan—it may be asked—speak the truth when he claimed as his own the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them? We answer in a measure, he did. He is called "the God of this world," and he did not hesitate to claim as his own by commission that which he had usurped by fraud and malice. His power, indeed, is marvellous, but mysterious. Claiming the kingdoms as his own, he addresses the Saviour in those impious words, "All these things will I give Thee if Thou wilt fall down and worship me."

Now it may be asked, and fairly asked, what was the *inward principle* in the mind of the Blessed Jesus that the devil appealed to when he thus offered to bestow upon Him the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them? In other words, what was the strength of this temptation? There are some who think that it was to ambition the devil appealed, and indeed, ambition is one of the most powerful principles that can agitate the mind of man, but I believe it had little or no place in the mind of the Saviour, ambition, I mean for worldly greatness; if therefore, in spreading out before Him the "kingdoms of this world and the glory of them," the devil by his offer simply meant to gratify ambition for worldly greatness, I think the temptation was little suited to the occasion. It was wanting in subtlety and power; it would have been appealing to a principle that had little or no power over the mind of the Blessed Jesus. "My kingdom" He says, "is not of this world; if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is My kingdom not from hence"—and when upon one occasion his friends wished to come "by force, and make Him a king, He departed into a mountain Himself alone" (John vi. 15). Satan's temptation, therefore, would have had but little force had he simply appealed to ambition in the heart of the Saviour. But no, I believe he appealed to a principle which, though sinless, yet was very strong in the soul of the blessed Jesus—that was the principle of fear connected with His future sufferings.

Satan knew well that the kingdoms of this world had been promised to the Redeemer. The Scriptures abound in such promises. "He shall be great," said the angel to Mary when announcing the tidings of His future birth, "and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His Father David, and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end;" and we read that "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever;" but then Satan knew well that the way to that kingdom *lay through suffering*, that the way to the crown was by the cross—according to that which is written that "He became obedient, unto death, even the death of the cross, wherefore God hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father," He knew that He must pass to His exaltation through suffering and death, even the death of the cross. From this suffering the Saviour shrunk. It hung over Him as a heavy cloud of sorrow. "Now is My soul sorrowful, and what shall I say." "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from Me." Now, I believe the devil in the temptation before us, took advantage of his knowledge of all this, and he offers Him the kingdom without the sufferings, the crown without the cross He so much dreaded, "fall down He says and worship me," receive the kingdom as a vassal at my hands, and all shall be Thine—without delay, suffering, or death. The temptation when viewed in this light was subtle and powerful, appealing to an inward principle that lay deep in the mind of the Blessed Jesus. Had He yielded, the work of Redemption was ruined, and man was lost for ever, for "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins."

And is it not in this way that Satan *still tempts* the sons and daughters of men. He takes them up as it were into "an exceeding high mountain," fires their imaginations, thoughts, feelings, hopes, and then sets before them the gaudy glitter and splendour of earthly greatness with the temptation, "fall down and worship me, and all shall be thine." And, alas, in our case he does not need to refine and conceal this temptation. It is sufficient for his purpose to set before men the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, or even a little of its gain, to induce them to receive it at his hands—or, transforming himself into an angel of light, he comes with the subtle temptation: "This position or station that you long for is indeed yours, yours by right of inheritance, or in the ordinary course of business, only you are debarred from immediate possession by some vexatious hindrance;" *that* he suggests can be easily managed; "use a little of the talents you possess, 'tis easily done, sign this paper, antedate your birth, remove the hindrance, and all this property, yours by right, will fall into your possession at once." Thus, men are tempted to perjury, falsehood, and forgery to gain by foul means what should come to them fairly in due course of time. And it is a proved fact, that many

have been tempted into the commission of murder to gain possession of some small property that falls in at the death of the murdered. Oh! brethren, "watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation," and in all your trials look by faith unto that sinless Saviour, "Who suffered being tempted that He might be able to succour them that are tempted."

And now let us look at the *manner* in which the blessed Saviour *met the temptation* of the wicked one. His language is firm, decided, and indignant. "Then saith Jesus unto Him, Get thee hence Satan," and following up this command with words drawn from the armoury of God's Word, he adds, "It is written thou shalt worship the Lord Thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." Words originally addressed to the Jews (Deut. vi. 13), but which, Jesus—identifying Himself with His people—here applies to Himself, because as the Son of man it behoved Him to fulfil all righteousness, that as a spotless victim He might offer Himself a sacrifice for our sins. It is remarkable that when Peter endeavoured to dissuade our Lord from the suffer ings which He told them that He must endure, He replied to him in the same indignant words which He here addressed to the devil, "Get thee behind Me, Satan," evidently showing that the temptation was the same in each case, and proceeding from the same agent, viz., to avoid the cross and pass on to the crown. But our blessed Lord, once more appealing to Scripture and drawing His weapon of defence from the armoury of God's truth, and thus leaving us an example as to the manner in which we should handle the sword of the Spirit in the hour of temptation, adds those memorable words, "it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt Thou serve." And then the devil, confounded by this application of the Word of God, which is "sharper than any two-edged sword," "the devil leaveth Him," and so the terrible struggle is over. The strong man armed is overcome by the stronger than He, and retreats from the field of battle. Like some dark thunder-cloud of night driven away by the tempest, so does he retire, covered with shame and confusion, muttering the language of his blasphemous indignation. And what an encouragement have we here to "resist the devil," with the assurance of the promise that "he will flee from us."

But the Evangelist St. Luke adds, when the devil had ended all the temptation, "he departed from Him *for a season*." He left Him, indeed, but to renew the conflict again; unable to tempt Him to sin He seeks to destroy Him and thus ruin, as he thinks, the work of man's redemption. "Satan, we are told, put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray Him." "Have not I chosen you twelve," was the sorrowful language of Jesus to His disciples, "and one of you is a devil"; and can we doubt the presence of Satan in the garden of Gethsemane when we are told that "His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground," the hand of rude man was not yet arrayed against him, but all the appalling terrors of darkness were upon him, and drew from His soul the prayer of agony, that, "if it were possible that hour might pass from Him." Oh, with what emphasis ought His words to fall on your hearts, "Tarry ye here, watch and pray."

But the conflict in the wilderness is now ended, and light breaks through the storm-clouds of night. For "behold angels came and ministered unto Him," angels who desire to look into the mysteries of redemption, and had watched the scene of temptation with wonder and amazement, now came and "ministered unto Him." They were present at his birth; in the garden of Gethsemane to strengthen Him, and on the morning of His resurrection to roll back the stone from the door of the sepulchre. And when He shall "appear the second time without sin unto the complete salvation of His people," He shall come in the glory of His Father, and "all the holy angels with Him."

And, blessed be God, they are still ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation (Heb. i. 14). And when the battle of life is ended, and the conflct with death is over we may hope that angels will carry our redeemed spirits—as they did the soul of Lazarus—into the bosom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Then—every temptation ended, every conflict over, palms of victory in our hands and crowns of glory on our heads—we shall look back on the past with wonder, joy, and praise; and with the many angels that stand round about the throne, and the living creatures and the elders, the number of whom we are told is ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands we shall join "saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing," and with "every creature which is in heaven and earth" break forth into the everlasting song of praise: "Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." Amen.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

THE PLACE OF FAITH IN THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM.

By the Rev. J. L. ROBERTS, M.A., Hon. Canon of Peterborough, and Vicar of Spratton, Northampton.

Sermon Preached to Men in St. Sepulchre's Church, Northampton, on January 5th, 1890.

Τῇ πίστει καθαρισας τας καρδιας αὐτων.
"Purifying their hearts by Faith."—Acts xv. 9.

I AM about to address you upon one of the greatest principles of human nature, and, if so, then upon one of the great unseen forces of the universe. Such a force is, as you are well aware, none the less powerful because unseen. The whole history of modern science tends to show how vast are those forces which operate unseen.

My subject is the place and office of faith in the Christian system; and my text will suggest why faith should hold so pre-eminent a place, and what is the office which it is appointed to discharge, viz., to purify the heart, and through the heart the life of man, "Purifying their hearts by Faith."

The reason that I have chosen this as the subject of my address is that prejudice which I believe exists in many minds upon this point. There are those who feel that there is something unreasonable, unpractical, and, if I may say so, unmanly in bidding men believe that so they may be saved by faith. It may help to clear away this not altogether unreasonable prejudice if I lay before you the following considerations. First, That faith is an absolutely necessary condition of human life. Second, That it is a very powerful, if not absolutely the most powerful factor in human life, especially in this its office of purifying the heart. And Third, That we are responsible before God for the faith which we hold or reject.

May God in His great mercy direct our thoughts aright through Jesus Christ our Lord.

First.—Upon the first point I shall not dwell at any length. When once stated it is so plain that I think you will all readily accept it. It is this, that the whole business of the world is transacted upon that faith which we have in each other or in ourselves. You have come here to-day upon the faith of an announcement which has been made. You will go to your business to-morrow upon faith in the engagements which others have made with you. You send letters or valuable goods to distant countries which you have never seen, and to parties who are personally unknown to you. You believe in the love and duty of your wife and children, and you give them your love and labour in return. Without faith in its teacher no child could even learn to read. Without what is indeed a most complete and remarkable exercise of faith you could not in sickness take the medicines prescribed for you by a physician, of whom probably you have no personal knowledge, and which medicines wrongly administered or in wrong proportions would cause you great suffering or death. On the other hand, you go through life in faith in your own powers, your own judgment, your own memory, and all this notwithstanding that your faith in other men or in yourself has often failed you. In fact, faith is the principle upon which human society rests, and without which it must immediately dissolve and fall to pieces.

I am not, therefore, calling you to any strained or unnatural effort when I ask you to believe in a God whom you have never seen, and in a soul which no dissecting knife has ever exposed to view. Yet God has abundant witness in His works, and the soul the unceasing testimony of her thought and consciousness. There has never been a theory of the world which could explain the existence of the universe apart from God, nor any theory of human thought and action which could explain their problems apart from an intelligent and immaterial soul. Faith is indeed earlier than evidence, yet is it not without evidence.

Second.—But I pass on to my second point, which is this: that faith is not only a necessary condition of human life, that without which its transactions could not be carried on, but that it is more than this. Faith—and from this point I speak chiefly, if not exclusively, of religious faith—is among the greatest, perhaps it is the very greatest, of those forces which set human life in motion and carry it forward towards its perfection.

Let me give an illustration of my meaning. If I go into one of the great factories which exist in this town, or on a yet larger scale in the great manufacturing towns of the North; or if I inspect the yet more wonderful and more exquisite machinery in our great national arsenal at Woolwich, I see a vast machinery in motion, huge hammers weighing, it may be, 30 tons, in perfect control, or delicate fingers of steel dealing with detonating powder, in which the slightest error would cause ruin to the whole. Then if I look for the motive power I see countless wheels revolving, turned by leathern bands or moved by connecting rods. All around me is movement, order, purpose; but I must seek yet further for the motive and sustaining power, and I find it at last in the expansion of a jet of steam, or the kindling of an electric spark.

Now faith, as I spoke of it in my first point, was as the lubricating oil, or as the supple band or the connecting rod; as now I speak of it, it is as the jet of steam or the electric fire, the moving and sustaining force.

The life of man has other and higher aims and duties than the mere transaction of business or amusement. It has other, and as I for one hold, higher aims and duties than even the cultivation of the intellect and the multiplication of the refinements and enjoyments of life. Its highest and

noblest work is in the purification of the heart and the affections, and the maintaining a true moral standard of virtuous action. I hold that a man's moral and spiritual nature is higher and nobler than even his intellectual nature, and that in a true sense an honest man is the noblest work of God. But I use the word honest in its old classical sense, including all that is gracious and that is honourable.

Who is there here that does not feel this? That the noblest man is he whom you can trust, whom you respect for his integrity, and whom you honour for his truth; the man who has his passions in command, his body in subjection, who is frank, generous and forgiving. Well, then, you, I am sure, will admit that this is so, but where is the motive and sustaining power in such a work? It is, as you know, a most difficult task, and undertaken at a great disadvantage. For one force to raise a man there are a hundred to degrade; for one to purify there are a thousand to pollute. Those of us who are acquainted with the history and literature of the ancient world know how foul was the life of Gentile society. The one institution of slavery, providing a ready instrument for every vice, was sufficient to spread the contamination through the whole body. Those who are acquainted with the facts of life in heathen lands know how cruel and how debased they are. Where then shall we find the cleansing elevating power? The words of my text, which are worthy of most thoughtful consideration, reveal to us the divine method. God "purified their hearts by faith"—God revealed Himself to them by the Gospel of His Son. And to know God was not only eternal life, but it was a changed life here on earth.

Did time permit, I could show how, in preparation for that message of His Son, God had dispersed his ancient people, the Jews, and how in every city of the empire the better souls among the Gentiles, weary of their impure life and seeking for better things, were taught in the Jewish synagogues of temperance, righteouness, and judgment to come. And thus it was, as you may read in the Acts of the Apostles, that men and women were ready to listen to the preaching of the Apostles, and learned not only of the living and true God, but also of the Creator and the Judge, and the merciful Redeemer of their souls.

To believe in the Father Almighty, in His power, His justice and His truth; to believe in His immediate presence, in His all-searching eye, in His righteous judgment. This, at the least, is a mighty power within the breast of men. If nothing more, it is a mighty power of restraint.

But the faith of the Gospel was much more than this. It was faith in the revelation of God, who, as He was infinitely holy, so was also infinite in love. It was the revelation of that new relation in which God stands to man as the Father of his spirit It was the revelation of that new relation in which man is brought to God as the child of His infinite love. It brought God and man close together into intimate personal relations. In a word, and that a divine word, it was the revelation of "Immanuel, God with us."

It was a strange and noteworthy thing to mark the purifying power of this faith. To see place after place vacant in the heathen temples and in the blood-stained arena, and to find their former occupants worshipping in the catacombs before the altars of the crucified. It was a strange and noteworthy thing to mark these, the flower of the Roman youths and maidens, offering themselves a willing sacrifice, in body, soul, and spirit, unto God, and confessing it to be their reasonable service. It was a strange and noteworthy thing to see them dragged before the courts, cast to the lions or into the flames, and counting themselves happy so to suffer for the joy that was set before them. None then could say that faith, the faith of Christ, was a feeble or a fruitless thing when the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the Church.

Much has been said and written upon the nature of justifying or saving faith. My text appears to me to give the most accurate possible description of its nature and work in the purification of the heart. It is the source and parent of the twin principles of a pure and holy life, viz., the fear and the love of God. The fear of God, no mean, slavish, dastardly terror, but the holy fear of the Holy Father, which draws a man from sin and from uncleanness. The love of God, which leads a man to love that which is good and right and excellent. For the man who loves God does, by a very necessity, love the good. And I must add that to this fear and love of God is promised and given the grace of God, and man is endued with power from on high. This principle of faith has demonstrably changed the face of society wherever it has prevailed. It has banished slavery; it has stamped out a thousand lusts; it has planted liberty; it has softened the very cruelties of war. It has built hospitals, clothed the naked, fed the hungry, cared for the sick. In a word, in teaching the Fatherhood of God, it has taught the brotherhood of man.

But this is not all. Faith has another and a purifying power in that it is the first principle and condition of all prayer. No man can come to God unless he believes that He is, and that He is the receiver of all who come to Him. Prayer is that exercise of faith which does most to purify the heart, as obedience is that which most purifies the life. O how different is a life with prayer and a life without prayer! A life dedicate and a life left to run riot. A life in which there is support in every trial and expression for every sentiment; a refuge in every storm. No man ever in sincerity knelt down to pray but he rose from his knees purified. But faith was the condition and the power of his prayer

I must however pass on to the consideration of my third point: a man's responsibility for his faith. We come here to a more strictly personal question and to a more personal aspect of faith.

Is there any here who has no faith in the living God? If it be so, let me speak candidly with you as a friend who cares deeply for your happiness. If you have no faith in God, it is possible that through utter carelessness, sinfulness or neglect, you have lost it. A man's faith in God receives abundant confirmation from reason; but it does not rest upon reason. Its seat originally is in the heart, the conscience, and the affections. A man does not believe in God as the result of some mathematical demonstration, but he believes in Him, and fears and loves Him as a child believes in his own father. Now a father may forfeit his children's love. He may make it impossible to love, honour, or obey him. But our heavenly Father has not forfeited our love, nor sent us out orphans into the world. The man who denies God does violence to his own nature. I say (and I am quite aware of the paradox) that atheism is an unnatural creed. I scarce know how a man can fool himself into it, though also I do know how a man may cast away his blessed faith in God. The truth is that men are little aware of the priceless value of that treasure of which they take but little heed. They lose the jewel e'er they know its worth, and find themselves to their horror without God in the world.

But you may say, and with perfect truth, "The Christian faith is more than a mere belief in God. It is faith in a special revelation; it rests upon special evidence; it teaches special truths."

All which I readily acknowledge. It is a special revelation; but of what? It is a revelation of perfect holiness, of perfect purity, of perfect and most intense love. It is the revelation, I grant you, of great mysteries, of the mysteries of divine compassion, of the mystery of divine pardon, of the mysteries—for mysteries they are—of perfect sinless humanity.

It may be that to some of us these mysteries were presented in crude repulsive forms; in the arbitrary cruelties of a narrow Calvinism; in the dry legal theories of a Lutheran justification; in the shallowness of a heartless formalism. Men have been repelled from the Gospel by burlesques of the Gospel. But look into the revelation itself. Look into the blessed life of Jesus. Hearken to His gentle and holy words. Search into that one treasury of holiness and truth which has been given to the Church that she may give it to the world. Can a man turn from the very beauty of holiness and be in no fault. If the divine compassions will not win you, if perfect righteousness offend you, is there not some wrong somewhere? Is there not an evil root of unbelief? When the Pharisee turned away from Christ it was the pride of his hypocrisy which turned him. When the Sadducee received Him not, it was the pride of wealth and luxury which closed his heart. But the good and gentle, the peacemakers, the pure in heart, the seekers after God, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, they heard Him gladly. His poverty was no offence to them, His humility no bar; for in His poverty there were the cords of sympathy, in His humility the sweetness of tenderness. They were "drawn to Him with the cords of a man."

But, again, you will say: "The mystery is too great; the gift too vast; the wonder too overpowering." My friend, what can save you? What can cleanse you? What can bring you peace that is not above yourself? Go! wash in the puddles of human philosophies. Will they cleanse you? Go! feed on the husks of human pleasures. Will they satisfy you? Go to the schools of human wisdom. Will they change your heart and purify your soul, and give you the hope of heaven and everlasting life? No! that which can do this for you must be divine, and all that is divine is mystery, *i.e.*, it is truth above us and beyond us.

It is God that approaches you in His gospel, God eternal, immortal, invisible, stooping to your embrace in the revelation of His eternal Son. Lay hold of the eternal! Cling to Him who is invisible! There may come a day when you will understand all mysteries, but not yet. Not until the heart be altogether purified can we see God—not until charity be perfect can we understand His love.

At present we know in part; not only so we believe in part. The prayer of the Christians will always be "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief." Meanwhile we walk by faith, and not by sight, and as we so walk our hearts are purified, our lives are raised, there is in us a power not of this earth, lifting us ever above this earth.

But if not, if we cast away our faith, or, as Holy Scripture expresses it, make shipwreck of the faith, amid the rocks and shoals of life, cast without anchor upon its temptations, its trials, its sorrows, its closing darkness, O think of the dreary, wretched condition of the man without God in the world. It is as one alone in the wilderness; all the brightness of the world fades as faith in God decays. Its pleasures vanish, its friends fall away. Its business becomes without interest, and its end, without faith, is therefore without hope. Without hope, indeed, but is it therefore without fear? Is unbelief, after all, so secure that it can meet death without a qualm? Is it so certain, or can a man convince himself, then, that the spark of intelligence, the invisible yet sovereign soul within him, can die? Is he secure in his scepticism? Will there be no God, no Judge, no immortality? If faith have not purified his heart, given it a hold upon the invisible, what shall assure him, now that he is passing from the things which are temporal to those which are eternal?

My friends, we are all, I trust, in our several capacities working-men. Be this our great object to "work out our salvation."

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible. 52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W. (Corner of Rathbone Place)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1890.

ANGLO-ISRAELISM—II.

WHEN a few weeks ago we directed the attention of our readers to this subject, allusion was made to the present wide-spread, though often unsuspected, belief in the truth of Anglo-Israelism. And it is a fact that now the Anglo-Israelite meets with far less bitter opposition when he advances his claims than he did some years ago. This non-combative spirit on the part of disbelievers may be accounted for by one of two suppositions. Some will say that is a clear proof of growing indifference; that the novelty has worn off; that it was a nine days' wonder which it is not worth men's while in these days to fight over and argue about. But this is an explanation to which we must demur, for there has *not* been gradually creeping in a spirit of indifference. Were it so, long ere this Anglo-Israelism would have lost its energy and vitality, and degenerated into a lifeless theory. We rather think the explanation is to be found in the fact that this subject is now taken up in a different, and we hope a more Christ-like spirit, than that which actuated its first promulgators. The old spirit of pharisaical pride is, we trust, dying out, and giving place in the mind of the typical Anglo-Israelite to a spirit of humble thankfulness for the wonderful privileges which this nation at present possesses, and also for those which he believes are yet in store for her. It cannot be denied that until quite lately the advocates of this belief have been in the habit of talking and arguing and writing in a spirit which was repellent to a spiritually-minded man. Their constant theme was the greatness and the power and the wealth of Israel in the latter days; they were fond of talking about the nation of whom it was said, "No weapon formed against thee shall prosper," and about the people who should possess "the gates of their enemies." From time to time they drew attention to the fact that England was the "head and not the tail." Like Israel of old, in the pride of their hearts, they forgot that these things came not by the strength of their own arm, but were the free gift of a God whose mercy endureth for ever, and, what was of still more consequence, they forgot that these blessings brought with them heavy responsibilities, and that God's one object, in heaping these favours upon His thankless people, was that the heathen might know that there was but one God, and that He was Jehovah. But we believe that now Anglo-Israelites are beginning to feel in their belief a deeper and a fuller joy than that which springs from a consciousness of the possession of earthly wealth and power; and coupled with this joy there must ever be a deep, real, and abiding sense of Israel's responsibilities. "Ye are my witnesses," saith the Lord. From the very nature of the case then boasting is excluded, for Israel has a mission to fulfil, and whatever power or privileges she may be in possession of are bestowed with the sole object of affording greater facilities for the carrying out of that mission.

Anglo-Israelism when looked at from this point of view is most certainly not repellent to the spiritually-minded man; and though maybe he has never seriously looked into this subject, he will not put it aside with a sneer when it is brought under his notice, but will, we hope, ask himself whether it is not incumbent on him, for his own sake, to test the truth of a theory which, if it *be* true, immeasurably increases the personal responsibility of every Englishman.

FREDERICK WILLIAM ROBERTSON.

BY THE REV. THOMAS B. NAYLOR, B.D., RECTOR OF WARRENPOINT.

FREDERICK WILLIAM ROBERTSON was born in London on February 3rd, 1816. His family had been closely identified with the military profession for generations, and from his earliest years Robertson had a strong passion for the army as a career, but as three of his brothers were soldiers it was decided that he must adopt another profession. He tried law, but one year sufficed to make him loathe the drudgery of a solicitor's office. His health failed, and he was urged to enter the ministry. "Anything but that,' he said, "I am not fit for it."

However, he entered Oxford in 1837, where the dreamy, sensitive youth soon became distinguished as a close, accurate reasoner. He was ordained in 1840 for the curacy of Mr. Nicholson, at Winchester. We shall let him describe himself: "There is something of combativeness in me, which prevents the whole vigour being drawn out, except when I have an anta-

gonist to deal with, a falsehood to quell, or a wrong to avenge; never till then does my mind feel quite alive. Could I have chosen my own period of the world to have lived in, and my own type of life, it should be the feudal ages, and the life of a Cid, the redresser of wrongs." This passion for a military career does not seem ever to have left him, and it coloured his whole life. But running through his dreamy, romantic disposition, tinged as it was by a strain of melancholy which often inclined to hopelessness, there was another and sterner characteristic—the energy that found its vent in hard work. One of his resolves, as late as his Cheltenham life, was "To try to overcome castle-building."

Yet he was eminently practical. "Work done," he says, "that lasts, and nothing else, through the wreck of hopes and the dissolving of this strange universe." "He that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." "In morals we only *believe* so far as we *are*." And again: "Poor Grotius' motto sometimes lies heavy on my heart, *Vitam perdidi operose nihil agendo*." And again: "I mourn not that I cannot be happy, but that I know not what to do nor how to do it." In one of his sermons he says: "Through ages, through eternity, what you have done for Christ, that and that only you are. Through the changefulness of life, through the solemn tolling of the bell of time which tells us that another and another and another are gone before us, through the noiseless rush of a world which is going down with gigantic footsteps into nothingness, let not the Christian slack his hand from work, for he that doeth the will of God may defy hell itself to quench his immortality." Broad and tolerant in his views, we are not surprised to find Robertson at one time leaning to the Tractarians, at another to the Evangelicals; nor can we wonder that he could not attach himself permanently to either school. But he neither joined in persecuting nor in reviling the Tractarians, and his dislike of the cant and bitterness of the extreme Evangelicals was quite as real as that which he felt for the vagaries of the extreme men of the Oxford movement. Speaking of the champions of Evangelicalism he said: "They tell lies in the name of God, others tell them in the name of the devil; that is the only difference." His appreciation of reality is a distinguishing characteristic all through his life. "Three things only in this world should receive no quarter—Hypocrisy, Pharisaism, and Tyranny . . . By Pharisaism in religion we mean not attachment to forms, but an incapacity of seeing or believing in goodness separate from some particular form either of words or ritual." Of Maurice he said: "Every inch a man, and a right noble one"; and he spoke of Arnold of Rugby in almost similar terms. Wordsworth was to him "the high priest of nature weaving in honoured poverty his songs to liberty and truth." He could see the danger underlying Shelley's exquisite delicacy and power to express the inexpressible, yet could do him justice: "False, miserably false, as his creed and system were, I do believe that a soul truly refined, pure, filled with a very large love, dwelt in him." "There was, however, a fibre of madness in his composition." "Shelleyism is only atmospheric profligacy." Of Shakespeare he says: "Shakespeare paints man instead of writing moral tales." Of Milton: "I have just read 'Comus'; what a noble poem that is! Shakespeare, of course, was the greater genius, but Milton was a sublimer man. How seraphically pure and elevated the atmosphere which he breathed. You feel the dignity of goodness in reading ten lines of what came from his soul." In 1847 he was offered the curacy of Brighton, which he accepted, and with Brighton his name has become inseparably associated. That this should be so is the very irony of fate, for he abhorred the idea of being regarded as a popular preacher. Those were the days of Chartism, when revolution was rampant, and we can with difficulty realise what courage it demanded from a clergyman to throw in his lot with the working classes. That which has since become fashionable and even politic, was then certain to sunder life-long friendships and evoke rancorous enmities. Robertson was keenly sensitive, and quite alive to the dangers of the course he felt constrained to adopt; he threw himself with all his wonted energy into the cause of the working-man. Odium, persecution, and isolation followed, but the combative spirit within him was roused by the outcry raised against him, and while taste, sympathy, and prudence drew him to the side of the aristocracy, his sense of duty led him more and more to sympathise with the cause of the poor. "That wretched beggar who holds his hat at the crossing of the street is God's child as well as you, if he only knew it. You know it, he does not, that is the difference; but the immortal is in him too, and the Eternal Word speaks in him." We can readily imagine what sensations would be roused in the minds of selfish, ease-loving, Church-going Christians by that sermon, "*The Message of the Church to Men of Wealth*," with its peroration like "the roll of Sinai thunders." "Upper and lower, as belonging to difference in property, are fictitious terms, true if character corresponds with titular superiority, false if it does not. Kings, masters, parents, here is a power ordained of God; honour it. But wealth, name, title, distinction, always fictitious, often false and vicious, if you can claim homage for these separate from worth, you confound two things essentially different. . . ." "We make men and women outcasts, and then expect from them the sublimest graces of reverence and resignation." Believing, as he did, that "man as man is the child of God," Robertson could hardly have acted in any other way; but the troubles which now began to close round him, eating into his life and impairing his health, arose from more causes than his attitude on the vexed question of the rights of the working-man. He had troubles connected with his Church. "The voluntary system, too," he says, "is detestable; it cuts the mouth like a Mameluke bit, reminding a man at every step of his servitude." His preaching provoked endless criticism, and exposed him to bitter and constant attacks, but he never varied from his course, though it is too evident that the constant irritation of those attacks told on his health and spirits. Robertson's letters are painful reading, but we can readily understand that they hardly give a true idea of the man when we notice that most of them were written on Monday, when he was labouring under the overstrain of the previous day. For he always spoke under tremendous excitement, though the excitement was reined in and kept in check by strong will. "Some of his finest sermons were thought out when distress of mind, it might be supposed, only gave him leave to feel; some of his hardest work in the world was done when his spirit was most keenly wounded." During his life he was but little known, for he published nothing, the only one of his sermons that was published in his lifetime being, "The Israelite's Grave in a Foreign Land." His views on Baptism may be

said to lie at the root of his whole system. "Baptism," he held, "is therefore an authoritative symbol of an eternal fact, a truth of eternity realised in time and brought down to the limits of *then* and *there;* then and there made God's child, but it is only a realisation of a fact true before baptism and without baptism, the personal realisation of a fact which belongs to all humanity, and was revealed by Christ; in other words, *it is redemption applied.*" Does Robertson here exclude baptismal grace? Evidently not. For he does not say that baptism is not the *medium* through which grace is given or redemption applied, but elsewhere he is more explicit: "Baptism is the revealed Will of God—that is, it is *the instrument* that declares God's Will." God's Will is a thing invisible; verbally the Will runs thus: "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." And just as the instrument which declares a will is called by a figure of speech "the will" itself, although it is but the manifestation of it, so the ecclesiastical instrument which declares regeneration is called regeneration in the Bible and in our Church Service. ". . . Baptism is regeneration as parchment is a will." His views as to prayer seem to approach to, if not indeed to coincide with, those of Blair. They are summed up in one sentence: "All prayer is to change the will human into submission to the Will Divine." Blair stated the same view in harder form, thus: "The efficacy of prayer lies not in working a change upon God, but in working a change upon ourselves."

Robertson was not a Universalist, though he hoped that Universalism was true. "My only difficulty," he once said, "is how not to believe in everlasting punishment." The Fatherhood of God was the one key with which he unlocked all mysteries, and his love to Christ coloured every action and word and thought of his life. When we come to consider his theological opinions, we are not so much surprised at the opposition they provoked in such a neighbourhood as Brighton, but we rather wonder that the odium did not take a more decided form. This, however, was due to the fact already mentioned, that the sermons were not published during his lifetime, and also to another circumstance noted by a friend, namely, that he preached with authority as a man possessed by the truth and reality of his message without wavering and without allowing himself at any time to be betrayed into taking up a defensive attitude. Towards the closing years of his life the strain of preaching told heavily on his health and spirits. "Sermons are crutches," he once said, "I believe often the worst thing for spiritual health that ever were invented." Yet his preaching gained in intensity as the mental and physical strain deepened. His belief in revelation was real and reverent, but he was as far from making the Bible an object of idolatry on the one hand as from rationalism on the other. "The inspiration of the Bible is a large subject. I hold it to be inspired, not dictated. It is the Word of God, the words of man; as the former perfect, as the latter imperfect." "I believe Bibliolatry to be as superstitious, as false, and almost as dangerous as Romanism." Yet he studied the Bible accurately, and was wont to say: "The man who succeeds in life is, allowing for the proverbial exaggeration, generally the man of *unius libri.*"

To Robertson God was not a *feeling* but a *fact*, and God's pardon of sin was therefore a fact. Similarly, he regarded the absolution of the Church not as an incantation creating that which did not previously exist, but as the declaration of a Divine fact. He declares what every one has a right to declare by his lips and by his conduct, but being a minister he declares it authoritatively in the name of every Christian, who by his Christianity is a priest to God; he specialises what is universal, as in baptism he seals the universal sonship on the individual by name, saying, "The sonship with which Christ has redeemed all men I hereby proclaim for this child"; so by absolution he specialises the universal fact of the love of God to those who are listening then and there, saying, "The love of God the Absolver I authoritatively proclaim to be yours." He summed up the Atonement thus: "The self-sacrifice of Christ was the satisfaction of the Father. . . ." "The pain of Christ gave God no pleasure, only the love that was tested by pain—the love of perfect obedience. He was obedient unto death." In 1850 his sermons on the Sabbath, the Atonement, Inspiration, and Baptism placed him in opposition to the whole religious world of Brighton; he became the talk of the town, and the unwary were warned to beware of him as a heretic and an innovator. He suffered what, referring to sermonising, he described as a "kind of mean martyrdom." His health gave way, and he died on August 15th, 1853, aged 37 years. Then the people of Brighton awoke to the fact that a prophet had been among them. Since then his fame as a preacher has spread wherever the English language is read or spoken, and probably no sermons have ever been more drawn upon by preachers or more frequently stolen than those of Frederick William Robertson.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR," March, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS number concludes with "Brevia," one on 1 Cor. xv. 29, the other by the late Professor Elmslie on Psl. xlv. 17, which seems to us so interesting that we extract it *in extenso.* "A standing puzzle to interpreters is the phrase in Psl. xlv. 7, rendered after the LXX. in Heb. i 8-9, as Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. This is unobjectionable in point of grammar, but has against it material considerations of a formidable character. The alternative translation, 'Thy God's throne is for ever and ever,' defies the principle of Hebrew syntax that no suffix may intrude between a construct noun and its following genitive. Passages cited as examples to the contrary are dubious, and the set of grammatical opinion is steadily against admitting the exceptional construction. Starting with the probability that in the Elohim psalms, the orignal sacred name יהוה has been displaced by a reviser, Giesebrecht points out the possibility that in this passage a יהיה=3rd singular imperfect of the substantive verb hastily read as the Divine name, was replaced by Elohim. If that were so every difficulty vanishes, and we should read, 'Thy throne is (or shall be) for ever and ever,' a phrase that has a close parallel in 2 Sam. vii. 16, and that leads naturally on to the thought of the following verse." Our only objection to this is that it is perhaps *too* clever; interpretations which avoid difficulties are always to be distrusted; but this one is much too good to be passed by unnoticed.

It needs not to say that the last of the late Bishop of Durham's articles on St. John's Gospel is interesting

and valuable; it is not, however, quite equal to its predecessors, and travels over more familiar ground. Dr. Plummer's "Recollections of Dr. Döllinger" is a very readable paper, and throws a light on the value of Church Councils—not favourable, but very much the contrary.

Professor Milligan writes with his usual clearness on the Resurrection of the Dead. His paper is really a running commentary on 1 Cor. xv., and is valuable principally for the way in which it shows what it was St. Paul really wished to prove.

Professor Beet continues his subject of the future state, but does not succeed in convincing us that the *present* participles, *ἀπολλύμενοι, σωζόμενοι*, are "appropriately" translated, "lost" and "saved." The conclusion the Professor arrives at, after examining St. Paul's Epistles is—"The only information about the state of the lost given by St. Paul is that their punishment will vary with their guilt." We should have thought it needed neither apostle nor professor to teach so obvious a truth.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE HUMAN KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST.

SIR,—In a recent number of the PULPIT I observed some strictures on a sermon by the Bishop of Meath, impugning his view that it is illegitimate to appeal to our Lord's authority for the settlement of such scientific, literary, or historical questions as from time to time emerge in the spheres of physical or critical research. From the writer's mode of handling the matter, it might be inferred that it is new to him, and that he is not aware either that the conditioning limitations of our Lord's human knowledge are an old subject of controversy or that Dr. Reichel's remarks were an obvious counterblast to a sermon of Dr. Liddon's occasioned by the publication of Mr. Gore's already famous essay in *Lux Mundi*.

The question as it has again emerged is this—Did our Lord's use of the Old Testament stamp with the seal of absolute truth the whole traditionary view concerning it, which was current among the Jews? By those who reply in the affirmative it is said, that as He made the Old Testament His own, accepted without protest the current tradition about it, and cited it according to that tradition, He must be understood to have adopted the entire tradition, and authenticated it with an authority which is absolute and conclusive for all who believe in His omniscience and trustworthiness.

On the other hand it may be replied that this view is fraught with serious difficulties. Had the Jewish traditions been limited to representing the Old Testament as an inspired record of God's gradual revelation of Himself to His chosen people, its authority might have been easy of acceptance. But the tradition went far beyond this. It embraced questions which lie within the ordinary sphere of human inquiry and knowledge—questions of physical science, literary criticism, history, chronology, and authorship. Such questions cannot be dogmatically foreclosed without the risk of producing dangerous antagonisms between faith and reason—antagonisms in which faith must always in the long run be worsted, since it is impossible for reason to deny itself. As a matter of fact such antagonisms have arisen plentifully, and have always ended hitherto in the triumph of reason. No one in his senses thinks now of subordinating astronomy, geology, or any other branch of physics to the Jewish tradition, notwithstanding the desperate efforts of dogmatists, age after age, to bind advancing science by it. And if the vast enlargement of our modern critical apparatus shall bring about a revolution, as it appears to be doing in the traditional view respecting the authorship, date, and historical bearing of parts of the Old Testament, a similar result is inevitable. How desirable then it must be to avoid, if possible, provoking such collisions and defeats! Lightly as they may be regarded by the ignorant or reckless dogmatist, they shake the faith of many, and bring shame on Christianity.

But it may be urged, we cannot help it. The authority of Christ is at stake. Perish science! Perish human reason! rather than that a word of His should be slighted. Yet surely, if reason is God's gift, and science is its fruit, there must be a way out of this dilemma. And that way will appear, when we calmly confront the assertion that Christ has placed the seal of His divine authority on the Jewish tradition.

It cannot be too carefully borne in mind that our Lord moves before us in the Gospels, not in the omnipotence and omniscience of His Godhead, but as the Son of Man specially anointed with the Holy Spirit to qualify Him to reveal the Father and do the Father's will. His power and His knowledge were the Spirit's gift to His Manhood, and were such as to equip Him perfectly for His work, and enable Him to teach infallibly and act freely in everything pertaining to His great mission and office. To say that, as the Son of Man He must by reason of His divine nature have been omnipotent and omniscient, is to assert what contradicts both reason and revelation. An omniscient human mind is as much a contradiction as an infinite finite being. Inexplicable as the mystery is, we know that He emptied Himself when He became man. Historically, we know that as a youth He grew in knowledge and wisdom; and that after the plenitude of His anointing there were still things of which he was ignorant, things which he could not do, things which he had yet to learn. It is certain, then, that during His whole earthly course the Divinity in Him was (as it were) in abeyance, and that He lived and taught and acted as a perfect Man in the power of the Spirit which rested on Him without measure. To hold otherwise, indeed, would land us in the absurdity of denying that He could be tempted, or troubled in mind, or suffer pain; for these things affect the the personality, and His personality was divine and could not be touched by them.

If this be a right view of Christ in His earthly life, there seems to be no ground for thinking that matters which lay outside His office were before His mind at all; still less that any modern problems of history or physical science or Biblical criticism were authoritatively determined by Him. When He had occasion in His spiritual teachings to cite the ancient Scriptures, we should expect Him to refer to them in the only way that would be intelligible to His audience, without the least thought of pronouncing, on the correctness of the current tradition about their date, or authorship, or literary qualities. Enough, both for His purpose and our edification, if His quotations were to the point. and the lessons He enforced by them true! Nay more! When one hears divines trying to extract from His recorded words, radiant with the light of spiritual

and eternal truth, decisions upon these inferior problems which are open to merely human investigation, cannot one imagine Him repeating His old, indignant remonstrance, "Man, who made Me a Judge and a Divider over these?"

PRESBYTER.

PAUL OR JOHN?

SIR,—I am much obliged to Mr. Maturin for answering my letter; and although I respect the reason he gives for the opinion he entertains that Paul referred to himself when he wrote of the vision in the 12th chapter of 2nd Corinthians, yet I remain as unconvinced as ever.

Mr. Maturin acknowledges it is difficult to believe that Paul referred to himself, but he adds it is more difficult to believe he referred to John, and yet curious to say he does not show wherein the latter difficulty lies.

I presume he means that the principal, if not the only difficulty, in accepting that view of the vision, lies in the chronology; but as the translators of the Revised Version of the Scriptures have abandoned chronology altogether, this obstacle may be considered as put out of the way.

That being so, I cannot see why Mr. Maturin should accept an interpretation merely on the plea that he has been accustomed to do as others have done. This plea would give countenance to many errors that once prevailed in the Church and in the world, but are happily dispelled by the clear light of accurate investigation.

What I contend for is, that the whole tenor of the chapter when considered in the light of Paul's character, epistles, and mode of action is at variance with the statement that Paul refers to himself, and is in strict accord with the interpretation that he refers to someone else.

"I knew a Man in Christ," he says, "fourteen years ago." Is that the way Paul would write of himself? "How that he was caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter. On behalf of such a one will I glory; but on mine own behalf I will not glory." Is it not clear the writer has not himself, but another person in view? Why make apology for Paul when he makes none for himself? Why give a meaning to his words which it is clear he did not attach to them? That Paul referred to John's vision I entertain not a shadow of doubt, and any other interpretation is a straining of the plain, simple, and palpable meaning of the chapter.

J. A. WALKER.

Dublin.

MISCONCEPTIONS.

SIR,—I observe in the PULPIT of this date, the reiteration of misconceptions, which would appear incredible to me, if I had not already seen them on numerous occasions.

It is repeatedly urged that if God saves some in this life, and saves the mass after death, He governs the world on two distinct and opposite principles. It seems to me as clear as sunlight that Christ came to save the world, and has adequate power and resources to accomplish the object. It is the declared and firm purpose of God, "having made peace through the blood of His Cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself." That is the *principle*, Universal Salvation; there are not two opposite principles.

"How can there be any lost, if they are all saved?" We cannot realise the fearful meaning of losing one's soul. We shall understand it better when we pass into another life. But we have striking illustrations before us, in this life, of the harrowing, withering effects, which continuance in sin has on the intellect, the affections, the habits and conduct. We sometimes witness a human life, blighted and lost in a career of vice which extinquishes all noble thoughts and feelings. Yet, not unfrequently, we see the sinner in middle life, or near its close, arrested by a sudden and powerful conviction, which as evidently comes from God, as that which changed the life of the Apostle Paul. But, as in his case, the terrible burden of past transgressions presses heavily during this life.

For any man to intimate or assert that the saving efficacy of Christ's Atonement, and the awakening, quickening, purifying influences of His Holy Spirit, together with the wondrous power of Christ's love to draw hearts to Himself are confined to the threshold of our immortal existence, appears to me one of the most illogical and absurd notions that can be entertained. For any one to present the Saviour to us as so grossly inconsistent, that He is full of tender anxiety to save, while animal life exists, but the moment it is extinct, He becomes callously, implacably indifferent, and will so continue while the immeasureable cycles of eternity roll on; so to present the character and work of the Saviour to sinners, is a most solemn responsibility.

I deliberately and indignantly deny that such representations are warranted by the words of the Saviour and the Apostles.

J. B.

Canonbury, 22nd March, 1890.

DR. LITTLEDALE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—"B." says the Romish doctrine has changed. Rome denies such change. All her present catechisms assert the old doctrine. "B." says that the *new* doctrine of Rome is, that not only the substance of the bread is changed, but also every accident, such as taste, smell, etc., are changed too: appearance alone remaining unchanged. Why one accident should escape change, rather than the others, is inconceivable. Of course, any one with their senses, can assure himself that the taste, smell, and hardness of bread still remain. A miracle is necessary to prevent our detecting such a change. This theory of Trans-accidentation, Rome condemned, though the name "Balsanum" recalls it. Dr. Littledale seems to favour the idea that Rome now holds that only the phantasms or apearances remain. Yet the *Church Times* denies this, and says that by "phantasm" Dr. Littledale meant all the accidents. But I pass from this. The real qusetions are two. What is Rome's teaching, and what is ours? Dr. Littledale, in order to advance union, mistakes both. Rome, he says, is less Roman. We less anti-Roman. As to Roman doctrine, the priest-editor of the *Catholic Press* of March 8th, 1888, immediately after Dr. Littledale's "Words for Truth" appeared, scoffed at the idea of any change. Every catechism, I have seen, teaches the authorized, unchangeable doctrine of Trent. But now I turn to

Dr. Littledale's perversion of our doctrine, as expressed in the Black Rubric. Yet, indeed, in order to do Him perfect justice, I must quote what he says of Rome, as well as of us. At p. 9, he says, "For whereas they (Romanists) formerly taught that only mere phantasms of bread and wine survive after consecration, now the received teaching is that no physical change whatever, of which the senses can take take cognisance, is effected by consecration, but that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain, as they were before." Now this is a very extraordinary statement as to Romish doctrine past and present. I am quite aware that phantasms are not really equivalent to all the accidents, as phantasms appeal only to our sight. The *Church Times* says that Dr. Littledale used the two terms as synonymous. What Dr. Littledale meant I cannot presume to say, I doubt if he knew himself. However, as "B." says that Dr. Littledale made them different, I will take him on that ground and show that he directly contradicts Dr. Littledale. Dr. Littledale has it that Rome formerly taught that only mere phantasms survive, whereas he says that *now* she teaches that *all* the accidents remain. This is the very opposite of what "B." says. He tell us that formerly Rome taught that all the accidents remain, *now* that she teaches that only the appearance remains. This is downright contradiction, But now I must come to what he says of our doctrine. as stated in the Black Rubric. After giving us Rome's present doctrine, as he misinterprets it, he goes on: "This (the Roman new doctrine) is the Anglican doctrine, that *they* remain in their very natural substance expressed in other, but equivalent language." Now mark the words that *they*, that is the accidents, remain. This, he says, is the language of the Black Rubric. But it is *not* so. What the Black Rubric says is that they, "the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored." It is that we may be allowed to adore a corporal material presence of our Lord's natural Body; that a change of substance is asserted, leaving only the accidents unaltered. This is what Ritualists are aiming at. Whether or not Dr. Littledale misquoted and misrepresented the Black Rubric, I now leave to your readers. That he did not quite it perfectly and correctly any one can see, though "B." says, "no one who understands the subject can doubt that he does so." Compliments or the contrary, after Hooker, I pass unnoticed. They do not affect an argument. To confirm *my* explanation of what Dr. Littledale says of the meaning of the Black Rubric, I will quote what the priest, the Editor of the *Catholic Press*, an impartial witness, says: "The Anglican doctrine, however, as contained in the 'Black Rubric,' at the end of the Communion Service, is, not that the *accidents*, Dr. Littledale's 'they,' remain in their very natural substances, but the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances." As the Priest and I agree, I think Dr. Littledale is corrected out of the mouth of two independent witnesses. Nay, as the *Church Times* says the same, I may make the two witnesses three. That mere accidents separated from their substance can have any substance of their own, I think to be impossible.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—I hear that a new edition of Dr. Littledale's "Words for Truth" is coming out, how it wil be changed we cannot know until we see it.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Abbott, Rev. D. W., Vicar of Cherry Willingham, and Vicar of Greetwell, Lincolnshire.
Beechey, Rev. P. W. T., M.A., Rector of Friesthorpe-with-Sharford, Lincolnshire.
Biscoe, Rev. E., M.A., Rector of Marholm; Rector of Irthlingborough, Northants.
Blinkhorn, Rev. George, Vicar of Ulceby, Lincolnshire.
Bower, Rev. M., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Southgate, with St. Etheldred's, Norwich.
Cartmell, Rev. J., M.A., Vicar of Kirby Bellars, Leicestershire.
Corner, Rev. A. E., M.A., Curate of Scarborough; Supply Chaplain to the Bishop of Adelaide.
Cundy, Rev. H. G., D.D., Rector of Beeby, Leicester.
Dalrymple, Rev. George William Bridges, Rector of Houghton-on-the-Hill, Leicestershire.
Darbyshire, Rev. B. S., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Lathom (Burschough), Lanchashire.
Deane, Rev. F. H., Vicar of Potter's-Bar, Barnet.
Drake, Rev. W. Y., M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Upper Chelsea, London; Rector of Stratton, Norfolk.
Edward's, Rev. C., M.A., Vicar of Bingley, Yorkshire.
Evans, Rev. John Edwardes, M.A., Head Master of the Grammar-School, Lymm, Cheshire; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Evans, Rev. J. Owen, Vicar of Towyn, Denbighshire; Rector of Peterstone, Cardiff.
Fallowes, Rev. J. P., B.A., Vicar of Coatham, Yorkshire.
Fitzroy, Rev. Lord Charles E., M.A., Rector of Euston and Barnham, Norfolk; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen.
Godson, Rev. William, Rector of Tothill, Lincolnshire.
Gray, Rev. W. A. G., M.A., Rector of Meavy, Devonshire; Rural Dean of Tavistock.
Hodge, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of Scredington, and Vicar of Threckingham, Lincolnshire.
Joscelyne, Rev. F. Hadley, M.A., Head Master of Kensington Grammar-School.
Julian, Rev. F. L., Vicar of Minsterly, Shrewsbury.
Marriott, Rev. Frank Ransome, M.A., Vicar of Warlingham-with-Chelsham, Surrey.
Morris, Rev. Ernest E., M.A., Curate of Bakewell; Vicar of Blackwell Derbyshire.
Payne, Rev. James, D.C.L., Rector of Furthoe, Northamptonshire.
Stayner, Rev. T. L., M.A., Rector of Stubton, Newark.
Stedman, Rev. R. Plumer, M.A., Curate of Halifax Parish Church; Vicar of St. Martin's, Brighouse.
Tattersall, Rev. R. W., M.A., Chaplain at Dantzig.
Thompson, Rev. R. B., B.A., Chaplain to the Military College, Cowley.
Tucker, Rev. B. S., Chaplain to the *Audacious*.
Venables-Williams, Rev. W., Vicar of Colwyn Bay; Chaplain to Mr. William Bostock, High Sheriff for Carnarvonshire.
Wareham, Rev. T. W., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Thomas's, Leesfield, Oldham; Curate-in-Charge of St. Thomas's, Newhey, Rochdale.
Williams, Rev. D. Bankes, Curate of St. Mary's, Swansea; Vicar of Cwmavon.
Wyles, Rev. Walter, M.A., Vicar of Coddenham-with-Crowfield, Suffolk.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Atkinson, Rev. Michael Angelo, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge; Rector of Fakenham, and Hon. Canon of Norwich, at the Mount, York, on the 22nd inst., aged 77.
Bowen, Rev. Christopher, of Totland, Isle of Wight, at Bordighera, on the 18th inst., aged 88.
Gray, Ven. Archdeacon, L.L.D., D.D., of Bruntsfield House, Harrow, late of Canton, China, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 16th inst., aged 62.
Hume, Rev. Wheler, Rector of St. Mary Magdalene, St. Leonard's-on-Sea, at St. Leonards-on-Sea, on the 23rd inst., aged 88.
Tyrwhitt-Walker, Rev. John, Vicar of Scottowe, and formerly of the Honourable Corps of Gentlemen-at-Arms, at Scottowe, on the 14th inst., aged 73.

The Church of England Pulpit.

"FORGERIES."

By the Rev. R. R. KANE, LL.D., Incumbent of Christ Church, Belfast.

Sermon Preached in Christ Church, Belfast, on the 16th March, 1890.

"Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong."—Jeremiah xxii. 13.

THERE happens to be such horror (not feigned horror, but real, let us hope and believe) in the mind of a great part of our nation at the present time in regard to the iniquity of forgery that it seems to me important in connection with our national anniversary to call attention to shameful and impious forgeries by means of which the Roman Catholic Church has imposed upon such a large portion of the Christian world and built up the most high-sounding and far-reaching claims to supremacy and to the teaching office amongst Christians. Forgery is a very base and very wicked thing, and no cause ought to prosper that will identify itself in the least with a practice—a device so abhorrent to every sentiment of honour and of honesty, though I don't know why it should excite so much horror and astonishment that out of a number of unprincipled men who have all for years been pursuing the most wicked and base courses one should seek to make gain for himself by playing his comrades false. Such things have invariably happened in the history of criminal and treasonable conspiracies, especially in this country, and will from the nature of the thing invariably happen to the end of time. The forgeries I wish to refer to this evening were on a more extensive scale and of an immeasurably more heinous nature; and the Church of Rome is to this day claiming privileges and powers of which these forgeries may be said to be the only foundation. The present Provost of Trinity College, Dublin (Dr. Salmon), has of late days published a book which treats of the Roman claim to infallibility. In this book the learned author makes such statements as "It is not more than the truth to say that the Roman claims have principally taken their growth out of two forgeries." "It is impossible to think that if Roman prerogatives had rested on any Divine gift it would have been necessary to bolster up the fabric with so enormous a congeries of fraud and lies." "Never have men incurred the woe, 'Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong,' more than the Popes have done both in respect to their temporal and spiritual power." The Popes are compared to men knowingly uttering forged cheques, and living on the proceeds of them. These are most grave statements, and we would expect the persons affected by them to be very eager to answer them, if they can be answered. They are not made by an obscure person, but by a scholar of European fame, and they have been noticed, too, by Roman prelates who ought to be in a position to expose them as false and calumnious, if they are false and calumnious. The Roman Archbishop of Dublin (Dr. Walsh) has referred to this book of Dr. Salmon's, and what objection has he urged against it? Why, he complains of the use of the term "Romanist" by Dr. Salmon. He says it is an offensive thing to call him and his co-religionists "Romanists." Now, Dr. Walsh may call us "Protestants" as often as he pleases, and we shall not complain. We claim to belong to the Catholic Church as Dr. Walsh does, but to distinguish us from others who make a like claim, it is convenient to call us Protestants, and we have not the slightest objection, but rather glory in the historic title, and an archbishop who has vowed obedience to Rome ought not to be ashamed to be called a Romanist. But why did not Dr. Walsh raise a more serious objection to the book in question? Before he was created archbishop he presided over Maynooth College. He was the principal of that seat of Roman theological learning! Why, then, did he not confute the very serious charges repeatedly made throughout the book that his Church is in the position of the man who knowingly utters a forged check and brazens it out in decent society on the money paid him over the bank counter for that fraudulent cheque? Why did not this Roman archbishop and ex-principal of Maynooth College point out that the author of the book to which he refers has wickedly calumniated his Church in stating that her claims to supremacy and infallibility are founded upon frauds and lies? Dr. Walsh cannot for a moment expect people to believe that he looked upon what came from the pen of the distinguished author of this book on infallibility as unworthy of his notice, and he must further have felt that his silence in the face of such serious charges would be accepted as an acknowledgment on his part that there is too much to be said in support of Dr. Salmon's position, and too little to be said against it. Here, at all events, is a remarkable and noteworthy thing. The Roman Church accused of building her claims on frauds and lies and forgeries and dishonest cheques, and a Roman archbishop and ex-principal of a seat of learning not even attempting to answer such serious allegations, but merely making a childish complaint about being called a Romanist. I believe impartial and thoughtful people will draw their own conclusions from Dr. Walsh's childish complaint,

in lieu of answers to the serious and weighty charges he ought to have felt it his bounden duty to meet. Now, these abominable and undeniable forgeries have a particular interest and a painful interest for Irish Christians. St. Patrick came to this country in the fifth century, and did a very great and imperishable work here as a Christian missionary and preacher, and until the twelfth century the Irish Church enjoyed autonomy—governed itself, knew no superior to its own episcopate, acknowledged no more obedience to Rome or to Canterbury than to any other see in Christendom. The Irish Church during those centuries was illuminated by learning, by piety, by zeal. Her schools were frequented by students from every part of Europe. Her teachers were eminent for their great piety and self-denial, and her missionaries carried the Gospel into Britain, and into many parts of the Continent, with the greatest blessing and success. But what happened in the twelfth century? It pleased Pope Adrian IV. to make a present of Ireland to the English Crown. This our Roman Catholic friends may find in Dr. Lanigan's ecclesiastical history; and the gift of Pope Adrian was confirmed by Pope Alexander III. Now to what intent did the Popes make a present of Ireland to the English Crown? The words of Pope Adrian's Bull are these—"To widen the bounds of the Church, and to extend her jurisdiction where she has none at present." The Pope exacted a further condition that the English king should pay him "a penny for every inhabited house in this island." So that the transaction on the side of the Roman Pontiff, at least, was of the most deliberate and carefully calculated kind. But what right had the Pope to make a present of Ireland to a foreign prince? In his letter to King Henry II. Pope Alexander III. says:—"As your Highness's Excellency is aware that the Church of Rome has by right an authority over islands different from what she possesses over the mainland and continent." This pretended authority was derived from the "grant of Constantine," an emperor who professed Christianity in the fourth century—a grant which was one of the most impudent and shameless forgeries ever imposed upon mankind. This was the forged cheque which the Pope uttered, and by virtue of this forgery he authorised a foreign prince to invade Ireland, and to annex this country to his dominions, on condition that he would subject the native and independent Church of Ireland to the dominion of the See of Rome. I leave it to Romanists to justify the conduct of the Pope in any way they can. But certainly, however they may try to argue that if Henry had not interposed the Irish would have annihilated themselves by their internal quarrels, which were very incessant and very bitter, and that, therefore, it was necessary in the interests of humanity and religion for the powerful king of England to interpose—however they may attempt this line of defence, they will not attempt to justify the conduct of the Pope in conferring Ireland on the English Crown by virtue of a forgery of the most impudent and shameless character. But while this particular forgery has a most painful and immediate interest for us, it is a very small one, indeed, compared to the whole body of forgeries on which the Popes have grown powerful and rich. Other people have suffered even more than the Irish people from this forged donation of Constantine. Gibbon tells us in his forty-ninth chapter that "this memorable donation was introduced to the world by an epistle of Adrian I., who exhorts Charlemagne to imitate the liberality and revive the name of the great Constantine. According to the legend, the first of the Christian emperors was healed of the leprosy and purified in the waters of baptism by St. Silvester, the Roman bishop; and never was physician more gloriously recompensed. His Royal proselyte withdrew from the patrimony of St. Peter, declared his resolution of founding a new capital in the East, and resigned to the Popes the free and perpetual sovereignty of Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the West." So that "the patrimony of Peter," of which Pius IX. said he was robbed, and of which Leo XIII. says he is robbed, was nothing but payment of a forged cheque which Pope Adrian I. uttered. By means of this forged cheque the Popes became temporal princes as well as spiritual potentates; and it is not possible for anyone to point to any part of the world where misgovernment has played a more useful part than in the Papal States. A very popular Irishman, whom Dr. Salmon quotes, and who as a writer is known as Father Prout, writing at the time of the accession of Pius IX., says—"All was desolate, waste, barren, and dilapidated beyond the public picture of the inspired writer, who has left on solemn record his landscape of the field of the sluggard, with its fences broken down, and other evidences of sad improvidences. I went by the field of the sluggard, and by the vineyard of the man void of understanding, and lo, it was all grown over with thorns, and nettles had covered the face of it, and the stone wall thereof was broken down. Then I saw and considered it well; I looked and received instruction, yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep, so shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth, and thy want as an armed man." This observer was hopeful that Pius IX. would inaugurate a new era which would exhibit the Pope as an enlightened and truly paternal prince. We know how this hope was disappointed, and how the Pope became so hated by his Roman subjects because of his misgovernment that he could only remain in Rome so long as French bayonets protected him. And when these were withdrawn he was driven from his capital. The dominions acquired by a most impious fraud

were more disastrously misgoverned than any province in the Turkish Empire, so that the change of masters in Rome—the political convulsion which deprived the Popes of their temporal sovereignty and dominions—was welcomed by the entire body of the Roman people, though that section of our own people who profess such a horror of misgovernment, and the chief article of whose political creed is that the will of the people is the supreme law, gave their sympathy and their assistance to the cause of misgovernment and foreign rule in Rome and Italy. Now, as the temporal power of the Pope had its foundation in fraud and lies, so also had his spiritual power. In the same congeries of lies and forgeries as the "Donation of Constantine" is found we have a number of forged letters, in which all sorts of power and privilege are claimed for the Popes. They are labelled throughout the world as the "False Decretals"—admitted to be false by both Romanist and Protestant. They appeared in the ninth century, and were turned to practical account in that same century by an ambitious Pope, Nicolas I., who employed them in furtherance of his very bold designs, and referred to them in all his controversies as deciding authoritatively the different points raised in favour of the Roman See. This Pope, who cited these frauds and lies as if they were Holy Scripture, has not been disavowed by the Roman Church, but, on the contrary, has been enrolled amongst her saints. After Nicolas—a long time after him—appeared Hildebrand, known as Pope Gregory VII., who may be regarded as the architect of the Papal system as an absolute spiritual monarchy. Gregory simply pushed to their natural development the principles and claims which he found in these "False Decretals." He accepted them as genuine records of the powers exercised by his predecessors, and insisted that he inherited these powers in their plenitude. Dr. Salmon says, "From these epistles it followed at once that the Pope was the sole source of spiritual power; without his consent no council could be held; every bishop, priest, or layman might appeal to him from every other judgment; the Church must be withdrawn from the control of all secular power, and be subjected to a single spiritual despot, whose errors and faults, if such there were must be borne in silence, for from him there could be no appeal." From these False Decretals were borrowed the peculiar privilege of the Roman Church to open and shut the kingdom of heaven, and the power of that same Church to depose monarchs and to release subjects from their allegiance. "For 700 years these Decretal Epistles had undisputed authority; yet the moment they were seriously assailed defence was soon found to be hopeless, and there is not a single Roman Catholic divine in the present day who would venture to maintain their genuineness." Well, now we know Rome never could have found her system in Scripture. When she ventures to appeal to Scripture her arguments are weak and inconclusive to an astonishing degree. When we ask the Roman Catholic for the Scriptural proof of the supremacy of the Pope, he replies Christ said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," and he understands by this rock Peter himself. But in the first ages, before the forged letters appeared, all the great teachers of Christendom, including Popes, understood by "this rock" Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." By the unanimous consent of the fathers this Scripture confers no supremacy on Peter, and to interpret Scripture contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers is, the Romanist ought to know, to incur an anathema. But, then, says the the Roman Catholic, Christ gave Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven. What did He give Peter the keys for? That he might bind and loose. Well, Christ gave the same power to all the other apostles—"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Here, again, then there is no supremacy for Peter; and if there were, it would remain to be proved that the supremacy was also conferred on Peter's successors, and that the Popes are Peter's successors, neither of which you know can ever be proved from Holy Scripture, or from any other authentic source. Then for the infallibility of the Pope, there is the same poverty of Scripture proof. You ask the Roman Catholic what proof he has from Scripture that the Pope is infallible. He replies, "Well, you know Christ said to Peter 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted strengthen thy brethren.'" Words of comfort and sympathy spoken by the compassionate Saviour, who foresaw the shameful fall of Peter, and in answer to whose prayer he did not utterly and finally fall; but it was never supposed that it contained a promise of infallibility until a search was instituted for some shadow of warrant in Scripture for the tremendous claim of infallibility. And just to give one other example of the Scripture's argument on the Roman Catholic side, I may mention that to justify their assumption of spiritual and secular power the Popes quote the words of St. Peter, "Behold, here are two swords." These simple words have been used by the Popes to authorise their claim, to wield the double sword of spiritual and secular supremacy. Christ said to Peter, "Put up thy sword into the sheath." Therefore, says Pope Boniface VIII., "there is in the Church both the temporal and the spiritual sword." So that you will see the Scripture arguments needed some support, and the forged letters of the ninth century supplied, after their own fashion, the evident need. And then the facts of history were as little friendly to the Roman claims as Scripture. As to the supremacy of the Pope, there

never was an age from the beginning when more than one half of Christendom did not emphatically reject the doctrines of Papal supremacy. The past and the present state of Christendom, the histories and records of all ages, are a perpetual demonstration against this pretended supremacy. And in particular, the history of our own country shows that for seven hundred years after St. Patrick the supremacy of the Pope was not a doctrine of the Irish Church. And what a testimony history bears against the doctrine of Papal infallibility. Pope Sixtus V. undertook to prepare and issue an edition of the Bible for the instruction of Christians. He claims to have taken the most excessive pains to have his edition of the Bible free from errors. It was published in 1590, with a constitution prefixed, in which the Pope said—"By the fulness of apostolic power we decree and declare that this edition, approved by the authority delivered to us by the Lord, is to be received and held as true, lawful, authentic, and unquestioned in all public and private discussion, reading, preaching, and explanations." The Pope further forbade this version to be altered in the smallest particular, and declared that any person who should violate this constitution would incur the indignation of Almighty God and of his blessed apostles Peter and Paul. Now, this version was found to be so gangrened with faults and mistakes, that it had to be withdrawn. So much for the Pope's infallibility. It will be admitted that the Pope's condemnation of Galileo was not infallible. For maintaining that the earth moved, the unhappy astronomer was condemned to the prisons of the Holy Office during the Pope's pleasure, and was commanded for three weeks to recite the seven penitential psalms once a week. So much for the Pope's infallibility. Then there is the case of the Pope Liberius, who adopted the Arian creed, and who apologised to the Arians for ever having defended the champion of the doctrine of the Trinity, Athanasius. Scripture was against them, and history was against them, and so they were very glad to have their case strengthened by these forged letters. Now, will candid Roman Catholics inquire into this grave matter? This man, this obtrusive prelate, who claims to be the vicegerent of God and absolute despot in things secular and spiritual, derives his pretended powers and privileges from forged letters. The path of the Popes to power has been paved with frauds and lies. Let the Roman Catholic people of this country seek the truth, and the truth, as our Saviour says, shall make them free. They are taught that there is no salvation out of a communion which has used shameless and impious frauds and forgeries to acquire place and power. The Book of God is of a contrary opinion, for it seems to be of this very communion we read that her cup is nearly full, and God's true people are called upon to come out of her that they be not partakers of her plagues, which "shall come in one day, death and mourning and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

THE SPIRIT OF DOUBT.

By the Rev. W. A. CUTTING, M.A.

Sermon Preached at Gayton Church, on Sexagesima Sunday, 1890.

"Hath God said?"—Gen. iii. 1.

THERE have been the ages of faith. "Heaven lies about us in our infancy"; and in the infancy of our civilisation the unseen world lay, or seemed to lie, nearer to men's apprehension than it does now. The present is, not indeed altogether, or almost, but in a certain marked way, an age of doubt and question: "Hath God said?"

For instance, what doubts have gathered round these first chapters of Genesis! Science now-a-days casts her flood of light backward on the genesis or natural history of things; we know that the household coal we burn is the fern-forest of æons ago; that the familiar chalk we burn to lime is the deposit of myriad sea-insects at the bottom of extinct oceans. The question has arisen, how the genesis according to nature agrees with Genesis according to Scripture? It is here "a little learning is a dangerous thing." A man reading for the first time that the heavens and the earth that are now are the slow growth of countless ages may rush to the conclusion, then *not* in six days did the Lord make the heavens and the earth. Only those who know nature and Scripture best tell us there is no ground for alarm; that the deeper they go the more a wondrous harmony begins to show itself under the surface difficulty.

Of course one cannot in a sermon that should in the main speak to the soul, that is, the heart and conscience of you, give a notion of what that harmony is. But this I say, that the way in which those opening chapters are full of the seeds of things that make up the world as we know it, is to me evidence of their Divine inspiration and authority, for wherever, and whatever, is seed, there is the finger of God.

What is meant by the seeds of things in these chapters will appear as we proceed. We have one ready to hand in the text, in which is the seminal suggestion of all doubt, of head or heart, to this day. Doubt of the head is when a man cannot receive this or that doctrine,—of the heart, when, while his understanding accepts it, he fails to get the comfort, the power, the life out of it for his own soul.

"Hath God said?"—has He spoken?—spoken at all?

Three voices of God are recognised: that in

Conscience, that in the Church, that in the Scriptures. I know of no fourth; not, at least, if the term Church be widened to take in the seers of all ages and peoples.

(1.) "Hath God said?" has He spoken through the Conscience?

Most certainly. And whoever tampers with His Conscience injures a most delicate member, the sensitive compass-needle of the soul, in danger of stopping its action, or worse still, perverting it. But we cannot accept Conscience as final and infallible. We cannot. One instance must suffice: Saul of Tarsus once "thought it right to"—*i.e.*, his conscience made him—"do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth."

(2.) "Hath God said?" has He spoken through the Church?

Again, most certainly. Scripture itself shows us God has always had a Church, and has spoken through it. Ill for me who am always longing for God to speak through the pulpit, as at sundry times and in divers manners He doth, to question His voice in the Church.

But neither can we accept this Voice as final and infallible. Dr. Döllinger has just died—outside the Church of Rome, of which he had been a most distinguished and devoted son. But "having (he writes to Dr. Nevin in 1879) for the last nine years gone over the whole ground of ecclesiastical history, when I am told I must swear to Papal infallibility, my feeling is just as if I were asked to swear that two and two make five and not four." Neither is the Christian Church herself infallible, for, she is not united. The very Creeds, invaluable as they are as primitive epitomes of "the things most surely believed amongst us," are not of independent or co-ordinate authority (as some, however, hold they are). Not, at least, in our own branch of the Church, which says, they are "to be believed, because to be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

So we come, thirdly, to the question.

(3.) "Hath God said"? has He spoken through the Scripture?

Scripture—as the standard for the rectification of Conscience and of the Church. We remember how the Bereans were "noble" for referring the Apostolic preaching—*i.e.*, God's speech in the Church—to the Scriptures, to see if things were so.

But here a question must be met: If there be a Divine Voice in Conscience and in the Church, how can it need rectification? A Voice Divine, and yet not final nor inerrable, how can this be?

The answer seems to be, that in Conscience and in the Church the speech of God reaches us through a medium more or less imperfect and even sinful. The Divine Voice in the individual and in the aggregate of Christians comes in contact with human limitations, and becomes conditioned by them.

Still a further question: But might not the like be said of the Scriptures themselves? What were Moses, Isaiah, St. Matthew, but men? What is language but human? None denies a human element in the Scriptures. How shall the Word of God in them then be absolute, any more than in Conscience or in the Church?

Easy to make answer with Dean Goulburn's phrase, "men inspired unto infallibility." But this is rather begging the question. No: "God hath spoken to us by His Son,"—the Word of the Father; and the absoluteness of Scripture lies n its recording and reporting *Him*.

Of course, the objector may persist, how do I *know* Christ to be the Word of the Father, the very Truth? One can only say that in every line of inquiry whatever one reaches ultimate fact, which there is no going behind. That fact, whatever it is, the scientist is as far as ever from being able to explain; but there it is. Even so Christ must be taken for the ultimate fact in our present line of thought and for our present purpose. Christ shines by His own light. If He does, reason can bring no lamp to show it. If He does, but is not seen as so shining, there is a defect of vision, for which reason is no remedy, though the Spirit of God *is*. But, "*Christus non bonus si non Deus:*" Christ, if not God, is no longer even good.

To return. It is just here, viz., against the voice of God in Scripture, that to-day the doubt is pressed, "Hath God said?" The Old Testament is criticised to tatters, and the very Gospels are thrown into the same mill. Another great man just gone from us, Bishop Lightfoot, owes his great name chiefly to his great and triumphant defence of the Gospel as authentic records of Christ.

If we have not the Scriptures as the sure Word of God, it is clear we cannot fall back on Conscience or on the Church. For the Church is not united, and consciences differ according to knowledge.

Now Christ magnified the Scriptures. Look at our Second Lesson. The Sadducees, rationalists and sceptics of His day, came to Him with their cavils, and were answered, "Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures;" "have ye not read that which was spoken to you by God?" The Pharisees, the party of tradition in doctrine and prescription in ritual, came in their turn: "Which is the great commandment in the law?" Again the answer was out of the Scriptures, and that in words on which, He claimed, "hang all the law and the prophets." Our Lord was satisfied with the Scriptures; yes, with the Old Testament, satisfied to rest His whole case, and man's whole hope, upon it.

That should be, must be, enough for us, His disciples. Satan, of this doctrine or that duty may ask, "'Yea,' thus and thus it is written, granted; but 'hath God said?'" till, seeing us waver, Christ recall us with His sad appeal: "Will ye also go away?" and we make haste to answer, "Lord, to

whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life!"

In conclusion, and in particular, reverting to our context, hath God said, "Thou shalt," and, "Thou shalt not"? Has He given a law which it is death to disobey? a Gospel which it is eternal death to disregard? The Old Serpent may be insinuating his old whisper, "Thou shalt not surely die." But the Bible does not say so. "No condemnation," indeed, "to them that are in Christ Jesus"; yet, "This *is* the condemnation, when light—the light of life—comes, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

A MEETING of the friends and supporters of the Pembroke College, Cambridge, Mission in Walworth, was held on the 19th ult. at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster. Dr. Searle, the Master of the College, referred to the effort that was being made to secure a better Mission-hall and an additional Missioner, and urged the meeting to consider these two objects as most important and pressing. Dr. Searle quoted from a letter from the late Bishop of Durham, in which the Bishop spoke in the highest terms of the new Missioner, the Rev. W. A. Hunter. Bishop Barry said that as a Cambridge man he was proud and thankful for the work that was being done by these college Missions, as much for the sake of the districts as for the colleges themselves. The diocese of Rochester was very heavily burdened in South London; its claims he considered more urgent than those of the east of London; the overcrowding was greater, as also the poverty. The income of the Rochester Diocesan Society was annually increasing, and the completion of the ten churches fund, together with the five college and two public school Missions, proved that great efforts were being made. Sir George Stokes, M.P., said that these college Missions were a very hopeful sign of the times. He expressed his strong opinion that religious controversy did little to help the growth of the spiritual life in the individual. It was far better to spend the time in practical work of this kind, and they would see then how much there was in common underlying their differences of opinion, and the tendency would be towards a softening down of these differences and a greater unity. The Missioner, the Rev. W. A. Hunter, spoke on the great difficulties of the work he had undertaken, foremost amongst which appeared to be the stagnation of thought in the district.

IT is announced that the consecration of Dr. Westcott to the bishopric of Durham will take place in Westminster Abbey on Ascension Day, May 15. The Bishop-designate and Mrs. Westcott paid an informal preliminary visit to Auckland Castle. Dr. Westcott when at Peterborough founded a voluntary choir, which has proved a valuable auxiliary in the performance of the musical portions of the services. On Friday the organist, precentor, choir, and sidesmen forwarded him a congratulatory address on his appointment to the see of Durham, testifying at the same time to the success which has followed the establishment of the voluntary choir.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 1890.

BROTHERHOODS.

AT this time when so much enthusiasm is being evoked for, and so much said by, leading men in the Church in favour of "Brotherhoods" for the younger clergy, it may be well since the question has now assumed some importance to look into and try dispassionately to examine the soundness of a system lately so extolled.

Undoubtedly on the face of it there is much to be said in favour of those who advocate celibacy for the first few years of a young man's life in the ministry, it leaves him free to enter upon work of a more severe and dangerous character than he would feel justified in undertaking whilst he knew he had a wife and family dependent on himself; he can as a celibate frequently go to places and do things which would be impracticable for him as a married man, and perhaps we ought not to leave altogether out of sight the moral training and discipline involved in the self-denying life of a celibate—training that must tend to affect the character for good and strengthen and ennoble it. Perhaps it was owing to the force of these considerations—which it must be confessed are very weighty—that the Church Missionary Society determined to make their rule, discouraging those who offered themselves for foreign mission work from being married before they had seen three or four years' service in the mission-field—and doubtless in many cases this rule has proved itself to be a wise and salutary one.

But on the other hand, we must not overlook the fact that it may also have its disadvantages. may we not in unduly pressing the importance of celibacy run the risk of not only effecting positive

harm, but also of passing over as of no account and so losing what might be of inestimable service in the work of the ministry. It is always hazardous to resort to anything contrary to Nature without very good grounds for so doing; and surely Nature says, let the young man marry. Surely it was for some good object that woman was made for the man, to be a help-meet for him; so then, celibacy cannot be a higher state than married life, since, what is unnatural and contrary to Nature cannot be better than what is in accordance with it. Nature governed by God's all-wise and immutable laws makes it natural for every true man to desire to have a help-meet, and if this help-meet be a true Christian woman it is impossible to overestimate the wonderful influence for good she might have on the life and work of her husband. Are we then calmly to assert, or at all events to *act*, as if we believed that no good could result from the influence of woman on the lives of the younger clergy. Is it not a truth testified by history, confirmed in every-day experience, that woman is at the bottom of every good work in the world—to her gentle but powerful influence is due the impulse, if not the carrying out, of every noble idea and achievement.

Shall we then deny her influence for good in the religious world? deny to her the privilege of assisting by her counsel and loving sympathy the labours of those who *because* they are young and untried in the work are the very ones to need all the help and sympathy she can afford!

But, after all, this must be a question for each man's individual conscience; different people are differently constituted, the same thing that is a help to one man may be a hindrance to another. In a matter like this no fixed rule can be laid down, but "let every man be persuaded in his own mind."

Reviews and Notices.

"THE LORD'S SUPPER." London: Elliot Stock. 1890.

SINCE Paschasius Radbert first broached the theory of a gross corporal Presence, there never was a time in which we were more bound than now to hold our ground between the two extremes. On the Zwinglian side, we are told that the bread is neither a means of grace, nor a pledge that grace is conveyed to us. On the Ritualistic side we are told that we and Trent teach "in other but equivalent terms." Again, the idea of bank-note conveying value is spurned because it is not actual gold, and we are told that steel by actual contact is turned into loadstone, though, to throw dust in our eyes, they call it by the name of magnet, which is nothing but another magnetised steel. But of all the extraordinary theories on the subject, that taught in this pamphlet is the most startling. The writer has spent labour, learning and space to prove what? That our Lord's Body in the Gospels and Epistles always means His Church. Now let us take His words, "Take, eat, this is My Body, which is given for you." So the Apostles were to take the Church, broken before them, and eat it, that is eat themselves, which is given for you. that is, that the Church is given for the Church. This seems incredible, but we will quote. At page 16 we read, "St. Paul certainly—there can be no rational doubt on the subject—understood by the phrase 'Body of Christ,' the Church." Again, page 17, "We will therefore paraphrase the words of Our Lord in harmony with St. Paul's doctrine. This (supper) is for you, the clothing and symbol of My Spirit—My time-manifestation." How to reconcile these two statements, that the bread is the Church, and yet the clothing and symbol of My Spirit, is beyond our powers of conception, much more of expression. One wonders what the author will do with the cup, having made the bread the Church, but that seems to give him very little trouble. He says it is the Covenant, page 53. Yet he comes very near what the Catechism says of the means, for he has "the outward symbol of communication was the drinking the Cup." But the agreement with us is only apparent, as communication he makes to be, not communication from Christ by the Cup, but communication among ourselves. At any rate "the blood which is shed" is not at all explained. The author seems to have no idea of reconciling our Lord's words with St. Paul's. It is a small matter that he says, page 87, that "it is no sacrament at all." We explain both statements thus. Our Lord, because of its virtues, calls the bread His Body. St. Paul says that the bread conveys to us that grace, on account of which our Lord calls it His Body. But this gentleman makes no attempts of the kind. Having made out that our Lord, breaking the bread and giving it to His disciples to eat, told that it was His Church, he then says that the κοινωνία of His Body was merely the Church feasting. He does not attempt to explain how St. Paul could mean "the bread which we break," that is the Church which we break, "is it not the feasting of the Church upon itself"? But we really must stop. It is vain to try to explain more fully what we are utterly unable to understand, or conceive how the author understands it himself.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—In your PULPIT of last Saturday I regret to see that none of your correspondents have replied to Mr. Heber Evans' letter of February 26th. It seems to me a pity to let it be supposed that an unqualified assent is given to all his statements, and that we, your readers, look at the matter exactly in the same light as he does. For my part I cannot agree that Greek words have a Jewish connection unless they are found exclusively in writings by Jewish authors and describing matters exclusively Jewish. A number of such words occur for instance in the LXX. It would take too long a time to go through the list of words Mr. Heber Evans has enumerated; but why should the very first one named, ἀναπέμπειν, be so considered, when, besides the classical authors referred to in Liddell and Scott, Josephus, to select one quotation out of many (Ant. vi. XVI. 3) has ἀναπέμπειν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα; Polybius i. 7, of prisoners like St. Paul,

ἀναπεμφθέντες εἰς τὴν Ῥῶμην ; Plutarch's *Moralia* has the word frequently both in this sense and (Bk. ii. 690, A.) in exactly the same sense as the Greek medicals, viz.: of distributing the digested food through the body. A word of so extensive a use cannot in any reasonable sense be called "Jewish." Much the same may be said for εὐθυμεῖν, the next word on the list. The verb εὐθυμεῖν forms part of a group of words expressing the same idea of "good cheer," as substantive, adjective and adverb. A reference to Liddell and Scott, where these words occur naturally together, will show again that they were in classical use. Josephus uses εὐθυμεῖν three times, εὐθύμιος four times, εὐθυμία six times, but εὔθυμος only once. Plutarch, *per contra*, has εὔθυμος six times, εὐθυμεῖν and εὐθυμία twice each, and εὐθύμως once only. This group of words was, therefore, classical and post-classical. It was used by the medicals from Hippocrates in the fifth century B.C. to Aretæus, of later date than Galen, and possibly of the third century A.D. Truly it comes nearer to swallowing a camel than straining at a gnat to assign to this word, εὐθυμέω, a distinctly Jewish connection.

I forbear proceeding with the list of Mr. Heber Evans' words. I cannot, however, refrain from noticing that while he refers to St. James in the terms of Archdeacon Farrar, which would imply, as they stand, that St. James' Judaism tinged his diction ; the fact is that "his style of writing is pure, elevated, poetical, betraying the influence of Grecian culture" (S. Davidson). This purity of style has led some critics to doubt whether it proceeded from his pen. Be that as it may, the fact that εὐθυμεῖν is found in an epistle manifesting cultured Greek is, *pro tanto*, against the inference to which Mr. Heber Evans would lead your readers.

Again, it may fairly be asked, what has Aquila's version of the Old Testament got to do with St. Luke's writings? Aquila wrote at least thirty years after St. Luke. Is it claimed that in his servile translation he employed eight words from St. Luke because they were more Jewish than any others he could find ? That idolatrous astrologer, excommunicated from the Christian fold, may have read St. Luke, but it is much more probable that he abjured all Christian books after his expulsion, and the last thing surely he would do would be to borrow from Christian writers, when writing with the intention of supplanting the Septuagint on which they so largely relied. But even if he did borrow those eight words enumerated in Mr. Heber Evans' list, that does not in the least affect the words themselves, or their use. Now what are those eight words which the renegade Aquila in some mysterious way affects ? One of them, κράββατος, is found in Mark ii. 4, and possibly may come from the Latin *grabatus*, used by Cicero 2 Div. 63, and surviving still in the French *grabat*, a pallet. At all events, not belonging to St. Luke exclusively, it must be excluded. Of the remaining seven, ἀνασείειν, ἐμπνέειν, and ὀπτός are certainly Homeric, and I suppose that even Mr. Gladstone does not endorse the notion that the fragrance of early Hebrew tradition, wafted Greeceward, affected the pure Greek of his favourite author. These words are found also in classical and post-classical authors. Ἀποθλίβω is philosophical, being found in Aristotle and Theophrastus ; it is post-classical, occurring in Plutarch, Strabo, and Diodorus Siculus ; παρατήρησις is found in Diodorus, Polybius, and Plutarch ; εὐπορία is classical and occurs in Plutarch ; as for the remaining συκόμορος, the name of a tree growing abundantly in Egypt, and supposed, though wrongly, both by Dioscorides and Theophrastus, the philosopher and botanist, whose works the former freely used, to grow also in Caria and Rhodes, what possible influence could Jewish proclivities have over its name ? Galen (De Aliment. Facult. ii. 35) tells us in a chapter περὶ συκομόρων, of one tree in Alexandria which he remembered seeing with its fruit like that of the white fig ; and Strabo (Egypt xvii. 2) names the fruit of the tree συκόμορον. To these four Greek writers Aquila was "a footless stocking without a leg," which is a definition of nothing, and, therefore, we may fairly add this last word to the former seven, and bring the whole eight words, like stray sheep from the Jewish wilderness, back again into their own native Greek fold.

To pass now from the particular to the general question, as regards the use or not of medical language by St. Luke, Mr. Heber Evans has arrayed his reasons against it, marshalling them like well-disciplined soldiers from the Septuagint, Jewish connections to which I have demurred ; but let it pass for the present, and for the last fifty words, bar one, from the classical and post-classical writers. He thinks, doubtless, that he has proved his case. How comes it then that the English school of criticism takes the opposite view ? All he has advanced was surely known to its leaders, Drs. Salmon, Farrar, Plummer, Plumptre, etc., long ago. They have weighed in the balance all his facts before they appeared in the PULPIT, and they have found them wanting. Does not this point to the necessity of fresh arguments and fresh facts if they are to be convinced ? Besides, there is one manifest flaw in Mr. Heber Evans' arguments. I will put it to him analogically. Suppose some one advanced to him, an Englishman, that Victor Hugo, the great French poet, had borrowed his dramatic and lyrical ideas from the great Sanskrit books of the Rig-Veda ; would it be rational and conclusive in him to settle this question from the chance jottings of a prejudiced reader of those Indian books, and not from his own personal studies in them ? So with St. Luke's medical language ; it cannot be settled without a close study and impartial report of the Greek medical books themselves.

F. T. P.

March 24th, 1890.

SIR,—I have only to-day seen the PULPIT for March 8th. There are a few corrections to be made in my letter. *Grenfield*, should of course be *Grinfield*, and the *Antiquities* of Josephus should be dignified with a capital letter. The marks of quotation appear occasionally to have gone astray, while the punctuation and the form of one or two of the sentences seem capable of amendment. I need not, however, dwell longer on these not very important matters.

It is, of course, quite obvious that Dr. Salmon, with all his eminence as a scholar and divine, is not qualified to sit as judge in this particular case. As head of that learned body, who are responsible for the issue of Dr. Hobart's work, the only position open to Dr. Salmon is that of co-defendant, and this cause is one which cannot be settled by the mention of great names ; it must be decided according to the simple facts and the clear evidence.

I naturally agree with "F. T. P." when he says "the two works of Luke are saturated with LXX. phraseology and Hebraisms," as I have pointed this fact out more than once in the pages of the PULPIT

How then can it for a moment be imagined that Luke, an *uncircumcised Gentile* (Col. iv. 11-14), "a heathen man" (Matt. xviii. 17), shunned by every devout Jew as "common," "unclean," "a sinner," and "a dog" (Acts x. 28; Gal. ii. 15; Matt. xv. 26), could, by any possibility, have acquired such a thorough mastery of those peculiar Jewish idioms of the Septuagint, with which the Third Gospel and the Acts are "saturated"?

It is also a most important observation of "F. T. P." that: "a goodly list can be made out of words used by medical writers in one sense, and by St. Luke in another sense, and that generally the sense of the other New Testament writers." In a previous letter I mentioned συστέλλειν as an example. Another very instructive instance is the word δοχή. Dr. Hobart (page 158) says: "This very rare word, used by St. Luke for a reception, is used by Aretæus for a receptacle." The passage referred to is Luke v. 29: "And Levi made him a great feast" (καὶ ἐποιήσε δοχὴν μεγάλην). This "*very rare*" word used in this *same phrase* (ποιειν δοχήν), and with the *same meaning* "to make a feast," occurs *three* times in the Septuagint, namely, twice in Genesis (ch. xxi. 8; xxvi. 30), and once in Esther (ch. i. 3). In Gen. xxi. 8 it is said of Abraham, (καὶ ἐποίησε δοχὴν μεγάλην), just the *very identical* words in Luke. So, too, the words, σκάφη and περιτρέπειν are *not* used in the *same* sense by the medical writers and the author of the Third Gospel.

I believe that the notion as to the medical authorship of the Third Gospel, being evident from the language, cannot be traced further back than to about the time of the late Queen Anne, of happy memory. The celebrated Dr. Richard Mead, who was the friend of Boerhaave, and who was afterwards appointed physician to George II., advocated this view. As, however, he "appealed for medical purposes to De Foe's 'Journal of the Great Plague,'" thus treating fiction as serious history, Dr. Mead's eminence as a physician would seem to have exceeded his skill as a literary critic—although the success of the author of "Robinson Crusoe" in "counterfeiting nature" may perhaps be admitted as some slight excuse for his mistake.

The opinion of Dr. B. Weiss, albeit brusquely expressed, must carry considerable weight. Dr. Weiss is, I believe, a Biblical critic of high repute in Germany. Some years since his works were commended in a letter I received from Dr. Gregory, the editor of Tischendorf's Greek Testament, just published. When, however, Dr. Weiss so abruptly says: "To profess to discover traces of medical knowledge is mere trifling," he appears to forget that even the great Wetstein observes on Acts xxviii. 8: "Lucas medicus morbos accuratius describere solet." I am not aware that the laborious Wetstein, whatever his failings, has ever before been accused of *trifling!* and, I may add, there is no trifling in Dr. Hobart's book. On the contrary, there is not only earnest purpose, but also solid and painstaking work. Moreover, it cannot be denied that there *are* apparent traces of medical knowledge, my contention is that these traces (which are obvious to the meanest capacity) are only apparent and *not real*—they do not, and cannot prove that the author was a professional medical man.

The long list of words (counted by hundreds) which are (in the New Testament) peculiar to Luke, and which Dr. Hobart, with patient industry, has unearthed in the medical writers, might well be deemed (as we know they *have* been deemed, even by such distinguished scholars as Dr. Salmon) to be evidences of medical knowledge in the author. The majority of these words, however, occur in the Septuagint as well as in *Hippocrates*, the first (*i.e.*, the *earliest*) and foremost of all the medical writers, and the works of the great Hippocrates (as great among the ancient doctors as Shakespeare among the modern dramatists) were in circulation during *a whole century* before the completion of the Septuaguint. When, therefore, we find that the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts was (as clearly appears from his *quotations*, and from the *substance*, *style*, *phraseology* and *purpose* of his books) thoroughly familiar with the Septuagint (with which his "work is *saturated*"), it seems impossible to deny that he must have derived these words, *not*, as a medical practitioner, *directly* from a study of the works of Hippocrates, but *indirectly* through the medium and channel of the sacred books of the *Septuagint*, which, as a devout Jew, he had from his youth up heard read, Sabbath after Sabbath in the synagogue.

H. HEBER EVANS.

March 18th, 1890.

THE HUMAN KNOWLEDGE OF CHRIST.

SIR,—Please allow me to make a few remarks on Presbyter's letter in your last issue. While refusing to join those who would forbid all research in Biblical matters, which might, as they say, beget scepticism, I should ever be careful against countenancing any system, which would lessen our Lord's authority as an infallible Teacher, or which to support its own theories, would limit the knowledge of the Son of God; and that too, especially, in cases where His references are made in support of doctrine, inseparably connected with our belief in His own individuality. There are many portions, as there are many persons, in the Old Testament to which our Lord did not specially refer; but those and all in connection with them, whom He did honour by even a passing notice, have gained thereby additional importance, which, while the Bible remains, will be connected with them. Your correspondent thus writes: "The question as it has again emerged is this. Did our Lord's use of the Old Testament stamp with the seal of absolute truth the whole traditionary view concerning it, which was current among the Jews?" How such a question could be answered in the affirmative is beyond my powers of comprehension. I reply in the negative, at the same time asserting that our Lord made the Old Testament itself, as apart from tradition, oral or otherwise, His own, which He never did "their traditions." He quoted them and referred to them; but because He did so, must I then be told that therefore "He must be understood to have adopted the entire tradition, and authenticated it with an authority which is absolute and conclusive for all who believe in His omniscience and trustworthiness?" It makes no matter what these traditions embraced; and anyone can see how our Lord treated them. Where they were not counter to the direct command of God, He may, I say it with all reverence, have allowed them, so to speak, though I must say that any reference to them by Him was certainly not in their favour. But to assert or suppose that we may put tradition in opposition to the Old Testament, where tradition and modern scientific research run counter to it, is to hold that both tradition and modern research are superior to the "Word of God," much more so to the Word of the Son of man. Here,

I must say, that in my former letter the word "tradition" never occurs, nor did I mean that it should; it was with the Old Testament, and with it alone, my remarks dealt. But further, because I am told that "to invest Him in His earthly career with all the omniscience of the Diety is to contradict the representation of the Gospels," am I therefore to give up my "belief in His omniscience or trustworthiness"? Who is to define what the measureless outpouring of the Spirit means? who is to define what are the particular branches of knowledge, human or divine, to which this Spirit had no reference, and on which it was incapable of forming an opinion?

Whether it be "*illegitimate*" to appeal to our Lord's authority for the settlement of any supposed Biblical difficulty, even where He may Himself have referred to the persons or subjects in questions, I leave to be decided by those who imagine that their conclusions, derived from critical research, would rest on firmer bases, provided they could assert that utterances such as His were never to weigh with us when human judgment had pronounced its sentence. For my own part I may say, that though not in any way presuming to possess the learning to which others have attained, I am still content to risk breaking such a law until such time when my finite human judgment will be more capable of discerning the mind of the Infinite.

INQUIRENS.

CHURCHMEN IN COUNCIL.

SIR,—Will you allow me to follow up your remarks on this subject. You speak of the three bodies into which the Anglican Communion is divided; and the attempts made to harmonize them, at least satisfy them by alteration in the Ornaments Rubric. Whilst some would make it only permissive instead of obligatory, others would change its language altogether. This seems the more necessary, as it is now said that its design is to put us back, not to what was legal during the seven last days of Edward's second year, but to what was legal during all the former part of it, that is, the use and ceremonies, if not doctrines of Rome, as left by Henry VIII. We see, then, that little harmony is to come from any handling of the Ornaments Rubric, especially as any change would require the assent of Parliament, consisting as it does, of Romanists, Dissenters, and Infidels of all shades of Agnosticism. Let us then turn from the Ornaments Rubric, which concerns only dresses, postures, and such like, and try if we cannot agree together in doctrine without sacrifice of principle on either side. If we can do this "Churchmen in Council" will not have assembled in vain. We will leave out of account the third party, the Broad Church, and try if we cannot hit on terms, on which the High and the Low might agree. The Sacraments are the great bone of contention. As to Baptismal grace, I see not why we might not agree, taking regeneration to mean merely adoption into the family of God. This is certainly what it meant originally. The Puritans gave regeneration a new meaning, conversion or the first motions of grace. But such is not its original meaning. It is an act of God's, not of ours. It is His adoption, as well of adults, as of infants. None need object to this view, except those who hold grace indefectible; and these are chiefly members of the nearly defunct school, the Calvinists. Supposing that we could agree as to Baptismal grace, we turn next to the Eucharist. Why cannot we agree as to this? Some take their stand on a Real Presence, meaning thereby what looks like a material corporal Presence. But, if they will be bound by the 4th Article, which lays it down that our Lord's ascended Body retains all that appertains to the perfection of man's nature, they must be content with a Real Presence of grace or influence, such as Ridley maintained before his judges. No Evangelical need object to such a presence of grace as this, real, being merely not imaginary. He holds that grace comes from God. Surely it may come as well with bread, as in any other way. This would suit St. Paul's words, "the bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?" Evangelicals, I think, might allow the High Church party to hold a Real Presence if thus explained. But now we turn to the others. What interpretation will Evangelicals put on the Church Catechism, such as will satisfy, not only their own consciences, but the High Church party as well? "The body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." This, they say, means transubstantiation, or consubstantiation at the least. But we say, it means no such thing. There can be no change of substance, because the bread and wine remain, as "the Lord hath commanded them to be received." They remain also unchanged in their nature, for they are still able to strengthen and refresh our bodies. In fact, the only Real Presence asserted is that of grace, which no one need object to, who holds that every good gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of Lights. Why cannot we all agree within the four corners of our own Articles and formularies? If we do, we need not trouble ourselves about the vestments, ornaments or postures of the contested Rubric. They can do no harm, so long as we all teach that our Lord's natural body is in heaven alone, and any Real Presence in the Eucharist can only be one of grace and influence.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

DR. LITTLEDALE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—I explained, in my letter in last week's PULPIT, the successive changes in expression of Eucharistic doctrine by the Romish Church. I did so more in detail than Dr. Littledale has done in his "Words for Truth," wherein, indeed, is to be found but a very cursory statement. I did not, as your correspondent Canon Crosthwaite supposes, contradict Dr. Littledale in anything. I am at a loss to understand how he can attribute this to me, when he immediately precedes the imputation by an acknowledgment that he does not know what Dr. Littledale means.

I admit fully, as I admitted before, that the Romish press contradicts Dr. Littledale's representation of Romish doctrine. But such a contradiction is worth nothing. The Romish press and Romish writers in general would contradict anything, no matter how true, or state anything, no matter how false, for an adequate or supposed adequate purpose. The particular writer quoted by Mr. Crosthwaite, the editor of the *Catholic Press*, further, either dishonestly or stupidly misrepresented Dr. Littledale's language in "Words for Truth," in his review of that pamphlet. He says that the quotation from the Black Rubric, *they remain in their very natural substances*, means

that the accidents of the Eucharistic elements so remain. It means no such thing. The antecedent of *they*, in this citation, is *the bread and wine* of the Rubric. Anything else is nonsense. Mr. Crosthwaite seems to adopt this misrepresentation, and to found on it an accusation against Dr. Littledale of misquoting the Rubric; the very thing that he does quote. The correct understanding of the passage in "Words for Truth" makes good sense and reason; aye, reason even unanswerable except by such writers as will say or contradict anything.

B.

29th March, 1890.

MISCONCEPTIONS.

SIR,—I cannot reply to the arguments in Mr Sandlands' letter in the PULPIT of the 22nd ult. because I cannot see what they are. But I wish to say that I do mean all that I write on serious subjects as serious reasoning. To write in a controversy on a religious question in any but an earnest spirit, would be, in my estimation, both discourtesy to my readers and irreverence to God.

I do not wish for the privilege of having the last word, and any reply I could write would be only a repetition of what I wrote before, except on this infinitely important point—that I do not, and other Evangelical believers in a final restoration, do not, deny future retribution. There is often a retribution for sin in the present life, and we believe that it will be more certain and more severe in that which is to come; but we believe that it will be not only retributive but also remedial.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 28th March, 1890.

P.S.—Since writing the foregoing, it has appeared to me that Mr. Sandlands quotes Our Lord's saying "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," to prove that salvation cannot reach the dead. The context shows that Our Lord meant the exact reverse of this—namely, that those whom we call dead are living. God is their God, and consequently their Saviour. Saint Paul says, "To this end Christ died, and lived again, that He might be Lord of both the dead and the living." (Romans xiv. 9.) I beg Mr. Sandlands' pardon if I have mistaken him.

AN ARGUMENT FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE.

SIR,—I do not intentionally presume to write anything new on this mysterious subject, yet it presents itself somewhat differently to different minds, and, if I am mistaken on any point, I should be glad to be corrected.

If I rightly understand the views of the different schools of Christian thought, it seems three views are held. By the first school, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is held to be Commemorative only; by this I suppose the grace belongs to it in such measure as corresponds with it in the heart of the receiver. By the second, the doctrine of the Real Presence, which is there by virtue of the consecration.

By the third, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, defining a condition which the second does not presume upon, and which is denied by the first school.

The opposition to high sacramentarian views leads the first school to seem to deny the *presence* of God's grace, though the possibility of its being in the Sacrament is not denied. Yet it is so unwillingly allowed, that it practically results in refusing to believe in any Presence at all, and reduces the Sacrament to a mere figurative or Commemorative rite. It may seem strange to think it, but it seems to put man in a stronger position than God, the man virtually saying, "Thy grace, O God, depends upon me. If I am right, then Thou art True, not otherwise; and I cannot sin, because I cannot believe Thy Presence can be in the Sacrament, by the mere act or declaration of a priest, so there is nothing to sin against." And this view is encouraged by a revulsion of feeling against the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, and also will not permit acceptance of the teaching of the Real Presence since it seems to incline too much to the Roman teaching.

God has appointed outward signs of His inward grace (Exodus xxx. 25), as we may see from the "oil" for anointing down to the Apostolic age, as in the case of the handkerchief of St. Paul. There should be no room to doubt the Presence of God is to be found and *felt* in the Holy Sacraments. And does not the argument from analogy emphasize the teaching of the Real Presence? Man is very clever and learned—being allied with God makes him specially so—and he may become more clever, need not be doubted, as years go on—*e.g.*, from Shakespeare with Puck putting a girdle round the earth in forty minutes, to Wheatstone, by the telegraph, making it a reality. It has taken years to develop electricity to its present perfection. Now, if man can send his thought and will to the other end of the world in a moment of time, if man can make a *wire* the channel of his will, surely God can make oil or bread or any substance the channel of his grace*. It is not to be supposed that the measure of this spiritual grace should always or of necessity be the same (Numbers xi. 24), as the grace, through Moses, was divided between seventy elders—or the parable of the talents—or, as St. Paul declares (1 Corinthians xiv.), all have not the same gifts. But these gifts, or measures of them, must be conveyed to us through some channel, and St. Paul takes the simile of the grafts, but for his purpose reverses the action, his grafts are grafted on to the goodly olive tree. We graft good scions on to the poor tree, but God, in his mercy, grafts us on to the best of trees. These terms must be used in a spiritual sense, and on examination St. Paul's simile bears a close analogy to the true state of the case. We were created in the likeness of God, and possessed Divine life, but by sin we were cut off from God. We fell as withering branches from the Tree. And now Jesus lovingly takes our nature, binds us to Himself, grafts us poor, withering, dying scions, not absolutely dead, because we have some measure of divine life left in us, and we are able to be relegated to the Father as sons; this is the *true religion*, to be bound in Christ. It is said, *e.g.*, "Bishop of Ripon's Bampton Lectures," man is a religious animal—man only has idea of worship in the measure as he has consciousness of something better within him, that leads him up to it; so St. Paul says, unless we be

* Might not a very powerful sermon be written upon the dangerous effects of ignorant handling of electric wires, as illustrative of the danger of intrusion into the sacred office of the ministry of God's Church, by uncommissioned ministers, or even of those in part commissioned, pressing uncalled into higher offices, Nadab, Korah, and others?

grafted into the Good Tree we must perish, for we sons by adoption and grace receive life from the Sap, the Blood of the Tree, without which they will die. Now, to take up with the use of words in the literal sense only, and not to allow spiritual meanings, would be very arbitrary ; it would be forcing words to "conceal thoughts and obscure the Truth" (for at best we do but see through a glass darkly), and leads people in dealing with heavenly things to lessen the value of God's Word. This was the error of the Jews who questioned how Jesus could give His Flesh and Blood for food. We receive life from the blood for our bodies, so we receive life from the Blood of Christ in the Sacrament for our souls, and thus are nourished by the Divine Sap, and become one with Him ; and herein, if the simile be true, the Church of Rome inflicts untold injury on her faithful laity by denying them the cup. To change the word Blood into Life, always would be an error, for it would destroy the idea of nourishment, and the flow or current of Divine Unction. It is the blood of Jesus which cleanses from all sin, and Jesus has promised that He will be present with His people ; and that this is to be understood in a spiritual and substantial sense is clear, since He is God-Man. As Man, He is ever present with the Father, pleading our sad cases before Him, and He never can leave that office for a moment. Yet as God, He is with us. Hebrews xii. 24 shows the double action or offices of our Lord in the sprinkling. He keeps up the Sap, and still does not vacate the office of Mediator. The Man is only in one place. This of itself is an argument against Transubstantiation. The God is everywhere, and this no less is an argument against a mere figurative or Commemorative rite, and the teaching of the doctrine of the Real Presence shines out stronger than ever. The Presence is real, and cannot be defined, and it needs no definition to a faithful recipient.

C. J. W.

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have made a grant of £400 in augmentation of the benefice of St. James's, Gatley.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous ; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

CURTAIL POWERS OF TAXATION.—In view of the rapidity with which British Taxation is being increased, not merely in Parliament, but by School Boards, County Councils, and Municipal Bodies, the Hon. Auberon Herbert writes:—"I am convinced the time has come to insist upon the individual's control over Rate and Tax. Either Taxation will kill us, or we must kill it." The friends of Peace, Retrenchment and Reform, may, with much advantage to themselves and their country, bear this suggestion in mind at every Election, whether Parliamentary, or for Local Boards generally.

ARCHDEACON FARRAR will not, as had been expected, preach the sermon on the occasion of Dr. Westcott's consecration as Bishop of Durham in Westminster Abbey on May 15. He is suffering from overwork, and, on the advice of his physician, will leave England for Italy shortly after Easter.

THE *Church Review* states that the Rev. J. W. Horsley has declined the Australian see which was offered to him.

WE regret to hear that Canon Farrar, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Durham, is so ill that he is ordered to give up work, and is going to Greece.

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have assigned a new ecclesiastical district to St. Peter's, Sowerby, Halifax.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bennett, Rev. George, Vicar-Choral of Salisbury Cathedral and Master of the Choir School ; Vicar of Folke, Sherborne.
Bird, Rev. J. G., Vicar of Christ Church, Dukinfield, Acting Chaplain of the 4th Volunteer Battalion Cheshire Regiment.
Clarke, Rev. Arthur Frederick, M.A., Vicar of Cockerham, Chaplain to Major Bird, High Sheriff of Lancashire.
Close, Rev. R. W., Rector of Conington; Rector of Childerley, Cambridge.
Cooke, Rev. W. C., Curate of St. James's, Gloucester; Vicar of Minsterworth, Gloucester.
Courtenay, Rev. T. Peregrine, Curate of Moretonhampstead; Vicar of Shaugh Prior, Devonshire.
Crouch, Rev. W., Assistant Curate of Fulbourn; Vicar of Gamlingay, Cambridgeshire.
Curtis, Rev. F. H. T., Vicar of Holy Apostles', Charlton Kings, Gloucestershire.
Davis, Rev. A. E. B., Rector of Brympton ; Incumbent of St. Luke's, Glasgow.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Callaway, Right Rev. Henry, M.D., D.D., late Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria, at Ottery St. Mary, on the 26th ult., aged 73.
Day, Rev. Maurice, Vicar of Wichenford, on the 28th ult., aged 63.
Dickson, Rev. William Richard James, at Woodland's St. Mary Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 62.
Fiske, Rev. R. W., Rector of Stockton, Wilts, formerly Vicar of North Leigh, Oxon, on the 28th ult., aged 67.
Gretton, Rev. Frederick Edward, B.D., Rector, at Oddington, on the 27th ult., aged 86.
Hopkins, Rev. William Bonner, B.D., Honorary Canon of Ely, for twenty-four years Vicar of Littleport, at Littleport Vicarage, on the 24th ult., aged 67.
Kinloch, Rev. Alfred, formerly Chaplain on the Madras Establishment, at 31, Monsom Terrace, Tunbridge Wells, on the 27th ult.
Sillar, Rev. James Annand, M.A., Incumbent of St. Peter's, Lutton Place, and Canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh, at Torquay, on the 27th ult.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RESURRECTION AS A WATCHWORD.

By the Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Easter Sunday, 6th April, 1890.

"Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my Gospel."—2 Tim. ii. 8.

I. A HEAVY burden had been laid upon the young disciple to whom St. Paul so wrote. Before he had reached middle life* Timotheus had been placed as the Apostle's delegate, with episcopal authority over the Christian community in Ephesus; and it seems clear that he was still responsible for that great trust when this letter was sent to him.† It is hard to realise the strain which at that time such an office must have put upon a man's robustness of conviction and tenacity of purpose. It needed, indeed, a clear head and a steady hand to guide the Church of Christ at Ephesus; it needed above all else a heart that no secret unreality or bitterness or self-seeking had been stealthily enfeebling against the day of trial. To believe with an unwavering confidence that the future was Christ's, in spite of all that pride and splendour of paganism which nowhere bore itself more arrogantly than in Ephesus; when all Asia and the world was thronging to the worship of Diana, to be always sure that her magnificence was worse than worthlessness, a hideous and degrading lie, that must break up and be gone like a bad dream at the first touch of light; to be quite untroubled by all the brilliancy and vigour of the social life in which the claim of Christ was blankly ignored or cleverly made fun of; to look up at the great temple, gleaming in the sunlight, famous as the one mansion worthy of the gods, and then to hold to it constantly that that little cluster of humble folk, meeting day by day for their Holy Eucharist, had found a truth and owned a Lord before Whose glory all that pomp and strength of idol-worship should be utterly abolished;—this could not but make for most men a severe demand on faith. But for Timotheus there were keener tests of reality and courage than all these. The language and emphasis of the two letters addressed to him strongly suggest the impression that he was not of a very tough, robust, or stubborn temperament. He was not the man who, when things seem to be going against him or getting into confusion, can shrug his shoulders and refuse to be harassed. Rather he seems one to whom antagonism, insolence, isolation, would mean sharp suffering; one whose heart might grow sick as he looked at a gathering storm of hostility and danger; one on whose courage and constancy such a storm would break with a severe, if not a staggering shock. And certainly there were black and angry clouds coming up over the sky; things promised a rough time for the Church at Ephesus. The recent persecution under Nero, though its brutalities may have been confined to Rome,* had shown what Christians might be called to face whenever policy or passion chanced to prompt a massacre; there were not wanting those who might find it convenient to stir up something of the sort at Ephesus; and the sense that it was always possible could not but tell on the position and outlook of the Church. But graver still was the mischief that was gaining ground within the Church itself; where the restlessness and superstition of some who had seemed to be sincere was corrupting the faith of Christ and foisting strange, morbid fancies into the centre of the Christian teaching; so that men were drifting off from all reality of religion, through idle talk and sickly exercises of perverted cleverness, towards that moral degradation which, in a place like Ephesus, closed in so readily as soon as faith had ceased to hold a man above it. Let us try to measure all these conditions by anything like the same scale on which we estimate the difficulties of our own day; let us remember how small and weak and unpromising a movement Christianity must have seemed to a dispassionate Ephesian critic; let us add the thought that Timotheus was on the very point of losing the one man through whose vivid, penetrating, and inspiring personality he had drawn the strongest impulse, the constant guidance and encouragement, of his life (since "the time of" St. Paul's "departure was at hand"); and we may probably feel that things were looking very dark and threatening and terrible to the sensitive and delicate man who had been placed in charge of the Ephesian Church.

II. If we were writing to a friend amidst difficulties so great, and especially if we were writing with the expectation that we might never write to him again, we should certainly be most careful what we said. We should do our best to enter thoroughly into his position; we should feel that there was a grave responsibility in being allowed to write to him at such a time, and that we must write nothing which was not absolutely real, and

* Cf. Salmon, "Introduction to the New Testament," p. 501.

† Cf. Gore, "The Church and the Ministry," 246-8; Alford's "Prolegg. to the Pastoral Epistles," 101-3; Shirley, "On the Apostolic Age," 116, 117.

* Cf. Merivale, "History of the Romans under the Empire," vi. 450. Robertson, i. 6.

likely to come home to him. And then, I think, this would be a part of our desire as we wrote—that we might fasten upon his memory with a deep and clear impression some thought which seemed to us most likely to emerge into the front of consciousness at the time of peril and despondency, and to rally the wavering forces of the will. We know how one recollection, distinct and dominant in the mind, has often been the decisive force at a critical moment; how upon the battle-field, for instance, or under the almost overpowering pressure of temptation, the thought of a man's country, of his home, of his ancestral traditions, has reinforced, as with a fresh tide of strength, his faltering heart, and borne him on to victory, whether by success or death. We may recall the scene in one of our African campaigns, the scene preserved for us by a clever artist, where the thought of a man's old school, and the boyish eagerness anyhow to bring it to the front, was the impulse of a splendid courage. Yes, there are images in most men's minds which, if they rise at the right moment, will do much to make them heroes; a word, a glance, some well-known sight, some old familiar strain of music, may beckon the image out of the recesses of the memory, and if the man has in him the capacity of generous action he will use it then.

III. It is on this characteristic of human nature that St. Paul relies as he writes to Timotheus the words of the text. He would avail himself of this; he would raise it to its highest conceivable employment; he would enlist it as a constant, ready, powerful ally on the side of duty—on the side of God. He may never see Timotheus, never write to him again; well then, he will leave dinted into his mind, by a few incisive words, one commanding and sustaining Image.* For it is not, as it appears in our English version, an event of the past, however supreme in its importance, however abiding in its results, that St. Paul here fastens upon the memory of his disciple; it is not the abstract statement of a truth in history or theology, however central to the faith, however vast in its consequences; it is a living Person, Whom St. Paul has seen, Whose Form he would have Timotheus keep ever in his mind, distinct, beloved, unrivalled, sovereign—"Bear in remembrance Jesus Christ raised from the dead." When the hardship which Christ's true soldier must expect is pressing heavily upon you; when the task of self-discipline seems tedious and discouraging; when the day's work seems more than you can bear, and when night, it may be, brings but little rest; when you are sick at heart to see folly and wilfulness, conceit and treachery, ruining what years of labour and devotion hardly reared, then let that ever-living Form stand out before you—"Bear in remembrance Jesus Christ, raised from the dead." Bear Him in remembrance as He now is, enthroned in everlasting victory. He toiled to utter weariness; He pleased not himself; He was despised and rejected; He was betrayed by one whom He had chosen, denied by another, deserted by all; He suffered more than thought can ever compass; and if ever "failure" could be written at the end of any enterprise, it might have seemed reasonable to write it of His work as they took His Body from the Cross. Well, then, if your tasks and disappointments seem too much for you, bear Him in remembrance as He now is. Never can the disproportion between advantages and difficulties, between resources and demands, have seemed to human eyes wider than when the Galilean Peasant came to found a world-wide kingdom; never did an unreasonable venture seem to end in a more natural disaster than when the religious leaders of His own people combined with the representatives of the Roman government to crush Him with a strong hand. Well, then, if the strength, the wickedness, the wealth, the confidence of paganism at Ephesus, at times appal and stagger you, if there seems something irresistibly discouraging in the brilliance, the culture, the self-sufficiency of the society which ignores or ridicules you, bear in remembrance Jesus Christ, raised from the dead, exalted now to the Majesty on high. Yes, bear Him in remembrance, not only as the supreme and all-illuminating instance of the victory that overcometh the world, not only as One Who has erased the word "impossible" out of the vocabulary that can be used in speaking of God's work, but also as the everlasting strength of His servants, the ever-watchful Guardian of His Church, as One Who knows your need and is indeed sufficient for your help, Who can never forget or fail you, beneath Whose gaze you serve, and by Whose love you shall be crowned.

IV. Let us take two thoughts this Easter morning, from the counsel which St. Paul thus gives. (*a*) First, that he is trying to lodge at the heart of Timotheus's life and work that which has been the deepest and most effective force of his own. St. Paul was convinced that he had seen the risen Lord; and the energy, the effect, of that unfading Image throughout his subsequent life might go some way to prove that the conviction was true. Physical weight is sometimes measured by the power of displacement; and in the moral and spiritual sphere we tend at least to think that there must be something solid and real to account for a change so unexpected, so unworldly, so thorough, so sustained through every trial, so vast in its practical outcome, as was the conversion of St. Paul. No doubt rests on the fact of the conversion nor on the greatness of its results; in regard to both we can appeal to Epistles which the most trenchant criticism leaves unquestioned; and if St. Paul declares that the whole impulse of his new life came from the sight of One Who had been crucified and had risen from the dead, we may surely claim that his witness is a real con-

* Cf. A. Plummer, "The Pastoral Epistles," 355-8.

tribution to the evidence of Christ's ressurrection. It may be set aside—it must be if our knowledge of all things actual and possible enables us to say that there can be no resurrection of the dead; but that would be a bold presumption. Or it may be justly said that no one man's conviction, however commended by its steadiness under trial and its practical effect, can bear the weight of so stupendous an inference. But then St. Paul's certainty that he had seen Christ after His crucifixion does not stand alone to bear that weight; it is but one part in a large and various mass of evidence. Similarly it may be said with truth that the convictions of enthusiastic men have produced immense results even when they were utterly mistaken. But let St. Paul's conviction be taken in its context; let justice be done to the character it wrought in him; to the coherence and splendour of the work it animated; to the penetrating, sober insight of his practical teaching; to the consistency, not of expression, but of inmost thought and life, which is disclosed to any careful study of his writings; lastly, to the grasp which his words have laid upon the strongest minds in Christendom through all succeeding centuries, the prophetic and undying power which, amidst vast changes of methods and ideas, men widely different have felt and reverenced in these Epistles—let these distinctive notes of St. Paul's work be realised, together with its incalculable outcome in the course of history, and it will seem hard to think that the central, ruling impulse of it all was the obstinate blunder of a disordered mind. This, at least, I think, may be affirmed, that if there were against belief in Christ's resurrection any such difficulty as the indisputable facts of St. Paul's life and work present to disbelief, we should find it treated as of crucial importance, and that, I think, not unjustly.

(*b*) "Bear in remembrance Jesus Christ, raised from the dead." It is the Form which has made him what he is, for life or for death, that St. Paul would with his last words, it may be, leave clenched for ever on the mind and heart of his disciple. The vision of that Form may keep him true and steadfast when all is dark, confused, and terrible around him. May not we do well to take the bidding to ourselves? We know, perhaps, that our hearts are weak, and our wills unsteady; the time in which we should have stored up strength against the day of trial may not have been used as now we wish it had been. For it seems as though life was likely to grow harder as the years go on, as though it might be very difficult "to have a right judgment in all things" and to keep loyally in the path of charity and truth. There are signs of trouble and confusion in the air, and some faint hearts begin to fail; and some of us, perhaps, "see not our tokens—so clearly as we did." But One we may see, as we lift our eyes this Easter Day; it is He Who liveth and was dead; and behold He is alive for evermore; He Who cannot fail His Church, or leave even the poorest and least worthy of His servants desolate and bewildered when the darkness gathers and the cry of need goes up; He Who may be to any one of us what He was to His Apostle; He, our strength against all despondency and irresoluteness and cowardice and sloth; He Who knows us perfectly, yet "loves us"—how strange it is—yet "better than He knows; He Who, if we have borne with patient courage our few years of trial in the twilight here, will receive us into that everlasting light which He both died and rose again to win for us.

CHRIST GREATER THAN SOLOMON.

By the Rev. G. JANNINGS, M.A., Rector of Warmsworth.

Sermon Preached in Warmsworth Church, on Sunday, January 19th, 1890.

"The Queen of the South shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation and condemn them: for she came from the utmost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here."—St. Luke, xi. 31.

OUR Lord points in these words to a fault which is by no means confined to the men of that generation. It is the fault, the *sin* of the great majority of mankind, that they have no love of the truth—no desire to find it—not even a thirst for knowledge.

This, it would seem, was the motive which induced the Queen of Sheba to undertake a long and toilsome journey in order to hear and profit by the wisdom of Solomon, for we gather from a hint let fall in the Scripture narrative, that the knowledge of nature—the study of what may be called the science of those times, was one department of the wisdom of Solomon. Not only did he answer all the hard questions—presumably questions on religion and morals—questions concerning the duty and the destiny of man, which the Queen of the South proposed to him. Not only was he remarkable for his words of wisdom for his "three thousand proverbs and his thousand and five songs, but he spoke, we are told, of *trees*, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spoke also of beasts, of fowl and of creeping things and of fishes," so that he was evidently a man who had a keen sense of the value and importance of all kinds of knowledge; he was a man of very wide and extended information, he was a student of nature, that is to say, of God's *works*, as well as of His word; and we gather from the commendation bestowed by our Lord in this text upon the Queen of the South, that in *His* judgment her love of knowledge redounded very greatly to her credit, and put to shame the indifference of the men of

His generation to that *higher* wisdom which He came down from heaven to impart.

1. First, then, we may say, that our Lord Jesus here puts the sanction of His divine authority and approval upon the love of knowledge.

This is a pursuit which has such an important and powerful influence upon the formation of character, that we may well expect to hear it spoken of with approbation by the Lord Jesus, in Whom are hid, as an Apostle says, all the "treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

It did not fall within his purpose and his plan to unfold the secrets of nature and to discourse at large upon the wonderful works of God—he came into the world for a higher purpose, viz., to impart to man that knowledge of God and of His truth which is able to make him wise unto salvation, but yet he drew lessons of heavenly wisdom from the book of nature. He bids us to "consider the lilies and to behold the fowls of the air," and learn from the care bestowed on *them* a lesson of *trust* in the providence of God. He would not have us go through the world, with the eyes of the mind closed, to the proofs which surround us on every side, of the wisdom and goodness of God! But although the love of knowledge, which is a characteristic of the human mind, is a divine gift, like other gifts of God, it has been marred and perverted by the fall, and is often turned to a bad use. It sometimes takes the form of a mean and petty curiosity, which loves to pry into the little details of family life, which has no other object of interest than the gossip of the day or the doings and foibles of one's neighbours. There is far too much in *all* ranks now-a-days of this sort of gossip. It was said in a leading London journal a short time ago; "There is, we regret to say, a growing habit which is hardening almost into a national vice of accepting and repeating vague gossip and mendacious scandal without hesitation or inquiry. The public taste has been vitiated by over-indulgence in gossip." This testimony is true. It applies in a measure to a country village, to small places as well as, perhaps, even more than to cities and large towns, for human nature is everywhere the same. Things are often said which ought *not* to be said, which have little or no foundation in fact; which lead to a breach of Christian charity; things by which characters are damaged and neighbours set at variance, and all through the abuse of the love of knowledge, because it has degenerated into mere idle curiosity. The proper province of the natural thirst for knowledge is the field of nature and the history of mankind, such knowledge as can be obtained by reading and observation. And slender indeed was the utmost knowledge which could be acquired in the days of Solomon, when compared with that which is *now* within the reach of the humblest student. We have not now to travel to the utmost parts of the earth in order to acquire a vast deal more knowledge than the Queen of Sheba could have learned from her interview with Solomon. A young person living in a country village may easily acquire from books, or from the observation of natural objects, a great deal of useful and interesting information, and assuredly the acquisition of any kind of knowledge must tend to enlarge and elevate the mind, to prevent it from falling a prey to roving fancies, and to dispose it for the reception of the higher truths of religion.

The reverent study of almost any department of nature can hardly fail to induce habits of thoughtfulness and solemnity, nor can any observer investigate the manifold proofs of design and of the adaptation of means to definite ends, which are so abundantly manifested in the world around us, without being thoroughly persuaded that all things are ruled and ordered by a God of infinite wisdom. When we see, as we *must* see, if we examine and reflect that there is *thought* in the universe, the inference is irresistible that there must be a *thinker*, an intelligent being, *i.e.*, who plans and thinks—in short, a living, personal God. And it is a great matter to be well assured of this, for there is many a fool now-a-days, who says by his life, if not in his heart, "there is no God," who lives without Him in the world, without ever reading His word, without calling upon Him in prayer for light and guidance. And of course there can be no such thing as any knowledge of God and of His truth, unless we *first* of all firmly believe that He exists. As an Apostle says: "He that cometh to God must believe that He *is*, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." And believing not in the mere customary and conventional way in which men commonly profess their belief, but believing in the deep of our hearts in a personal God, Who made us, who cares for us, and to Whom we are responsible for our actions, we shall gladly learn all that can be known of His purposes and intentions towards us, and what is His will concerning us; and where shall we learn this, if not from the words of Him Who is greater than Solomon, Who came down from heaven to be the light of this dark world, that in seeing *Him*—seeing, that is, His character and His work of love and power—we might see the Father.

2. We gather, in the next place, then, from the words of our Lord in this text, that we may learn of Him truth of far higher value and importance to us, than all the wisdom of Solomon. Jesus came down from Heaven, not to tell us about God's works, but about His character, to reveal Him to us as a loving and forgiving Father. This is a knowledge of the first importance. Other knowledge is useful and improving—*this* is a matter of life and death. The study of God's wonderful works is indeed pleasant and will reap a rich reward, and it will no doubt form part of the happiness of a ransomed race in the life to come. Scientific knowledge may enlarge our views of God's wisdom and goodness and power, but the

knowledge which we learn of Jesus teaches us to know God *Himself*, and this is life eternal. At the time when Jesus appeared among men the world scarcely wanted, and was not in a condition to use the knowledge, which in these latter days mankind has acquired through the study and observation of the more gifted of the sons of men; but the knowledge of God and of His love is needful for all men in all ages; it is a knowledge which can make even a child who possesses it "wiser than the aged who keep not God's precepts."

The world could afford to wait for the revelations of science, but nothing else, save the revelation of the love of God in the gift of His dear Son, nothing else but His marvellous work of redeeming grace and power could have saved the world from utter corruption. The fulness of the time had indeed come when "Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." To have imparted to man the knowledge of the occult forces and hidden secrets of nature, and to have left him in ignorance of the way in which his sin could be pardoned, and his weak moral nature renovated, and he himself renewed in the spirit of his mind, would have been to leave him ignorant indeed.

Not thus has God dealt with us, nor is it any just cause of reproach to the Bible, that it does not touch upon those branches of knowledge which relate to the things of this life, or that in some places it even uses language which is somewhat at variance with the conclusions of modern discovery. With regard to such matters, it uses popular and not scientific language. Holy men of old were inspired not to teach science, but religion. And when we open the pages of the New Testament and compare it with the Old, or compare the knowledge conveyed to us in it with that of the foremost men of science and learning of our time, we may indeed say, "A greater than Solomon is here." And would He, who is meek and lowly in heart, would He, think you, have spoken thus if it had been a question of superiority of one mere man to another. Had this been all, we may venture to assert that Our Lord's human greatness would have prevented him from saying it.

He was indeed "greater than Solomon," both in intellectual stature and in moral worth. Witness His marvellous parables uttered on the spur of the moment, exactly adapted in many cases to the immediate circumstances and yet so framed as to be pictures of truth and beauty, in which all men may find instruction and delight. Solomon again in his old age fell into sin and folly. Jesus was "holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." He "did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth;" but He was greater than Solomon, above all, in His nature and person, because in Him "God was manifest in the flesh," because in Him "dweltall the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

He declared Himself to be greater than Solomon because He must needs speak the truth, because He knew Himself to be "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," the only hope and refuge of all mankind.

And if the Queen of the South will rise up in the judgment and condemn the men of that generation who regarded not the word of the Lord Jesus while He walked the earth as man. Will she not also condemn those who refuse His light and easy yoke, now that He has shewn Himself, by His resurrection from the dead and by centuries of wonder-working spiritual power, to be the Lord of Life?

If the Queen of the South came from the utmost parts of the earth to learn the little that Solomon could teach her, will she not rise up in the judgment and condemn those who, with an open Bible and the Church of God set up in their midst, refuse to give heed to the word of Him who is "greater than Solomon," to that word which is alone able to make us wise unto salvation? God forbid that any of us should be found at last to be among the number of those who have refused to give heed to His words of Eternal Life.

ERRATUM.—On page 167, on seventh line from bottom of second column, read *religated* for *relegated*.

THE Dean of Norwich announced on Sunday week that for the future the seats hitherto appropriated in the cathedral would be free. Exceptions would be made in the interest of the aged and of those who might have defective hearing. To such he should be most willing to allocate places.

THE Bishop of Salisbury has consented to act as chairman of a committee for carrying out the restoration of the historical church of the Holy Cross at Ramsbury, Wilts. The church stands on the site occupied by what must have been the cathedral, or mother church, from 909 to 1066—when the Bishops of Wilts and Dorset were Bishops of Ramsbury.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary. **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1890.

BISMARCK'S RESIGNATION.

THE German Empire without Bismarck as its Chancellor is hardly more conceivable than the play of "Hamlet" with the character of Hamlet left out. But the world must reconcile itself to the strange omission, at least for the present. Prince Bismarck has resigned the Chancellorship, and this time the Emperor has accepted his resignation. It has been plain for months that there was a good deal of friction between the great Chancellor and his young sovereign. Both of them loved power; neither could bear to play second fiddle in the imperial orchestra. But here the resemblance between them ends. Prince Bismarck's claims to give counsel and to have it respected rests upon the solid basis of matchless ability as a statesman, and priceless services to the State. The Emperor's pretentions have no personal foundation, or, at any rate, none that is discernible. Hereditary right is his sole title to rule. If he were not the son of his father, and, as such, the head of the house of Hohenzollern, no one would think of putting him in the scales to be weighed against a Bismarck. His opinions upon grave questions of imperial policy would count for as little in Berlin as those of any other young officer of the guards whose spurs and sabre were his most likely means of making a noise in the world.

When Bismarck became the chief adviser of the grandfather of the present Emperor Prussia had little voice in the affairs of Europe. Austria was the great power which controlled the German States. But William and Bismarck humbled the pride of Austria in battle and in council. Annexation of smaller States made Prussia powerful, and it called into existence the North German Confederation. When Napoleon III. was rash enough to declare war on Prussia in 1870 Bismarck and William had made that kingdom a dangerous antagonist. The magnificent army of Von Moltke crushed France in a few weeks and opened the way for Bismarck's crowning work. Peace on harsh terms was accorded the defeated nation, and William was crowned Emperor of Germany at Versailles. During the succeeding years the Iron Chancellor has toiled unceasingly to place the newest-born State in Europe at the head of European affairs. His success has been wonderfully complete.

Well, a crowned head is a crowned head, even if it shall prove to be an empty one. So Prince Bismarck, unwilling to surrender his ripe judgment to the guidance of his inexperienced master, has stepped out, and the Emperor has closed the door behind him. In retiring from the high office which he has filled so well, the great Chancellor can say with truth that he found Prussia an inconsiderable State, the servant and mouthpiece of Russia, bullied now by Austria, now by France, and respected by none of her neighbours; and that he leaves her dominant in Germany, and in a Germany that is mistress of Europe.

Having called into existence the most powerful nation in Europe, Bismarck may well wonder as he abandons his labours what will become of it in the hands of other men. Great changes must follow his disappearance from public affairs. The aged statesman has held the peace of the continent in his grasp for years. No one can carry on his work as he has done. Europe must now become less warlike or go to war.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR," April, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THIS is an exceptionally good number of *The Expositor*. There are only five articles, but all are very good. Mr. Stalker tells his divinity students that the study of theology is very far from being worked out, and we quite agree. Evolution, the study of ancient religions, the structure of the books of the Bible, and many other new theories, correct or only partially correct, have to be examined, and the manner of the building of the great spiritual temple must be carried on accordingly. With all Mr. Stalker says on the need for the clergy being students we cordially agree, and heartily wish the clergy were more known as scholars and less known as takers of chairs and organisers of bazaars.

Dr. Plummer continues his "Recollections of Dr. Dollinger"; Professor Godet writes very clearly on the "Logical Arrangement of Rom. v. 5-17."

Professor Margoliouth writes on Ecclesiasticus, but we have not done more than look through the article

which is full of Hebrew, and will need leisure and much use of a lexicon.

"WORDS FOR PEACE: A PASTORAL, ETC." By the Most Rev. Lord Plunket, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. Dublin: Hodges & Co. 1890.

THIS pastoral was drawn forth by charges made against certain Dublin clergymen of Ritualistic teaching and ceremonies, and also against certain clergymen of the opposite school, of negligence in their modes of conducting service. The Archbishop counsels exact conformity of both parties to the rules of the Church, and of charity and forbearance one with the other. He has not much fear of Ritualism. But at the end of his pastoral he has notes to the effect that crosses are harmless in themselves, and objectionable only so far as they are held forth as teaching Romish doctrines as to the Eucharist, the Corporal Presence, and adoration thereof; the other serious error is connected with auricular confession and absolution.

The Archbishop quotes the Bishops in the Lambeth Conference: "It is their (our) deliberate opinion that no minister of the Church is authorised to require from those who may resort to him to open their grief, a particular or detailed enumeration of their sins, or to require private confession previous to receiving the Holy Communion; or to enjoin, or *even encourage, the practice of habitual confession to a priest;* or to teach that such practice of habitual confession, or the being subject to what has been called the direction of a priest, is a condition of attaining to the higher spiritual life." To this authoritative utterance of the whole British Episcopate, the Archbishop adds his own deliberate opinion. Speaking of the invitation to those troubled in conscience, he says most forcibly: "An extreme remedy is hereby provided for an extreme case of disease. It is, in fact, with man's soul as with his body. The physician may be compelled at times to use a deadly narcotic for the relief of exceptional pain. Even then he labels the bottle 'Poison!' knowing well that its habitual use would infallibly sap all the foundations of health, and bring his patient to an early grave." If the clergy teach their flocks thus as to crosses and confession, there is little danger of Ritualism spreading in Dublin.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

REPENTANCE, CONFESSION, ABSOLUTION.

SIR,—In his sermon on the above subject Canon Rawstorne says:—

"Then the question arises, How far does this Church forgiveness extend? From what sins can it absolve? What penalties can it remit? And the answer to that question is very clear. The Church can only forgive those sins which have been committed against herself. She can only remit those punishments which she has herself imposed. She can only welcome back to her communion the sinner whom she has herself excluded. She can go no further. The sinner, whom his brother has forgiven a personal offence, is received into friendly relations again; the one, whom society forgives a breach of her usages, enters again into her social circle; so the one whom the Church has forgiven takes his place at the Lord's Table again. That is the whole of her forgiveness, her absolution, her remission of sin—name it as you will. The remission of the sin against God remains beyond her power and beyond her understanding; it awaits the judgment of the Omniscient."

That seems to me to mean nothing more than that the Church has power to expel and re-admit. But every society—because it *is* a society, and not a mere mob—has that much power.

A Conservative Club, a "Browning" Society, a football club, can expel a member who disobeys the rules, and can, if it likes, re-admit him. If the Church can only do this, then the words, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," etc. (Matt. xviii. 18), and "Whosoever sins ye remit," etc. (John xx. 23), do not mean much.

Again, Canon Rawstorne speaks of the "presumption" of those "who assume a superhuman function without any qualification for their impossible task—of the illiterate, narrow-minded priest; of the curate who has just, and hardly, passed his final examination; of the persons, too numerous in every religious community, who have sought a priest's office that they may eat a morsel of bread." For such men blame the bishops. But the incompetence of an individual does not affect the powers appertaining to his office. There are men in the present House of Commons "with whom I consent no not even to eat"; yet I have not the slightest hesitation in praying for the "High Court of Parliament," for it is *that* officially, not because of the "virtues" of some of its members, who would be better employed working the tread-mill.

LANCASTRIAN.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—"F. T. P." in his last letter (the PULPIT, April 5th) invokes the aid of Victor Hugo and "the great Sanskrit books of the Rig-Veda;" but it is difficult, at first sight, to comprehend how these will throw light on the *so-called* medical language in St. Luke. "F.T.P.'s" elaborate philological disquisition on a few particular words does *not in the least* weaken the force of my main argument. Dr. Hobart came forward, with the official sanction of the University of Dublin (of which Dr. Salmon, now the head, has long been a distinguished and leading member), offering us "a proof from internal evidence that *the Gospel according to St. Luke* and *the Acts of the Apostles* were written by the same person, and that the writer was a medical man." I ventured to question this, and I pointed out in my letter in the PULPIT of March 15th that "out of the whole 415 words given in Dr. Hobart's Index, all but about 65 are to be found in Schleusner's 'Lexicon of the Septuagint.' Thus 350 of the words are to be found in the Septuagint—65 *only* are *not* to be found therein" (350 being a round number slightly over the mark). Now, "F. T. P." himself admits what is perfectly clear to everyone who takes the trouble to examine the facts—namely, that "the works of St. Luke are saturated with LXX. phraseology and Hebraisms." But are not *Hebraisms* the private property and distinguishing badge of the peculiar and isolated *Jew?* It is quite obvious that Hebraisms would not be used by the medical writers. They come from a *Jewish* and *not* from a *medical* source. Hence

it seems quite evident on "F. T. P.'s" own showing that these 350 *so-called* medical words, occurring in the Third Gospel and the Acts, come, not *directly* from the doctors, but from the *Jewish* Septuagint, into which, doubtless, many of them found their way from the writings of the great Hippocrates, which were published about 100 years before. What, then, becomes of Dr. Hobart's *soi-disant* "*proof*" that "the writer was a medical man?" There is no proof at all, especially as I have shown that Dr. Hobart gravely propounds "*pure* Hebraisms" as *signs* of medical knowledge—a blunder to which, I do not hesitate to say, the learned University of Dublin should not have affixed their *imprimatur*, and which would be very euphemistically and inadequately described by the remark of Dr. Salmon, the Provost, that Dr. Hobart "pushes his argument too far." Too far, indeed! Beyond the bounds of probability into the bogs and swamps of downright error. Even the (comparatively) few remaining words (65, or, to be more exact, 67 in number) are *not*, in the least, *peculiar* to the medical writers. Some are quite common words, while most are to be found in several well-known Greek authors. What proof can be furnished by these of special medical training in the writer of the Third Gospel? None at all. Among them are about fifteen words used, as I have said, by Jewish writers, including St. James (whose "Judaism tinged his diction," undoubtedly—see *Grinfield* and *Westcott and Hort*) and Aquila (a Jew, or Jewish Proselyte—see *Prideaux*); but this is of no vital importance to my argument, and "F. T. P.'s" learned observations are quite beside the mark.

As for "a flaw in the arguments," which "F. T. P." fails to demonstrate, that is for the decision of all unprejudiced readers who will calmly weigh the facts. These facts speak for themselves so loudly and so emphatically that "F. T. P.'s" plea in arrest of judgment (till the dawn of the twentieth century) must be at once rejected—the pathetic plea that he has not yet completed his self-imposed task of wading through the works of the voluminous Galen (who wrote no less than 300 volumes, the greater number—happily for "F. T. P.," if not for humanity at large—having been burnt in the Temple of Peace at Rome, though five folio volumes still survive for "F. T. P.'s" behoof). If I may, after so much dry argument, be pardoned one moment's trifling, I should say—

"Neither "F. T. P.'s" researches, nor Dr. Salmon's pen,
Can set Dr. Hobart's theory on its legs again."

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 5, 1890.

P.S.—When "F. T. P." makes the astounding statement that Dr. Salmon, Dr. Farrar, and other eminent critics weighed in the balance all my facts before they appeared in the PULPIT, I can only wonder if they are gifted with "second sight," and refer to my remarks above as to mistaking "*pure* Hebraisms" for professional medical language. Archdeacon Farrar himself says: "The theme has been greatly (and perhaps unduly) expanded by Rev. W. H. Hobart."

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—If a general inference may be drawn from the letter of "*Inquirens*," it would seem that the discussion which was originated by Mr. Gore's essay, and is still being carried on with unabated interest, is far from being distinctly understood by many to whom the subject of it is new. Hence I would crave permission to say something more about it, with an apology to those who know, if I am repeating very obvious things.

First, I would beg your correspondent to observe that the discussion in no way concerns those traditionary precepts and customs, which through the teaching of the Rabbinical schools had formed a hedge round the law, and while imposing a grievous burden on the Jews, had in many cases made void the Word of God. The tradition in question was quite of another kind. It related to the Old Testament, as a collection of ancient writings of various dates, authorships, and literary characters; it was, in a word, the received or current view about the origin, structure, and general character of the Old Testament. According to this tradition, for instance, the Pentateuch was entirely the work of Moses; the greater part, if not the whole, of the Psalms was ascribed to David; the whole book of Isaiah to Isaiah of Jerusalem; of Zechariah to the post-exilian prophet of that name; of Daniel to the Daniel of the captivity; of Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon to Solomon. Further, the Old Testament narratives were as a whole accepted in the letter as strictly historical, those in the earliest chapters of Genesis as much so as the story of the later kings, the books of Esther and Jonah equally with the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is with this general tradition alone about all such matters that the present discussion is concerned.

Next, it is to be observed that there is no question in this discussion about the inspiration of the Old Testament writers. It is admitted that there was an inspiration, a breath of God stirring within them and qualifying them to write; that they had a message to deliver, a revelation to communicate or enforce, a contribution to make towards the unveiling of the Divine character and purpose. Diverse as were their endowments, their knowledge, their methods, they were all instruments in the hand of God to carry on the education of the world.

Once more, there is no question in this discussion about the infallibility of our Lord's use of the Old Testament to illustrate and give point to His teaching. Just as it is allowed that He taught unerringly concerning God and man's relation to God, so it is equally allowed that He seized with unerring insight the spiritual lessons which lay hid in the letter of the ancient Scriptures, and made those lessons His own.

The discussion thus becomes limited to this single issue. Are we free to examine the Jewish tradition about the Old Testament by the canons of historical and literary criticism, and to modify it where the investigation shows that it is not reasonably tenable; or are we bound by our Lord's authority to accept the tradition as a matter of faith, which human reason has no right to challenge?

A few prominent instances will illustrate the nature of the problem, and we may take for the purpose those on which Dr. Liddon has laid especial stress in justifying his denial of our freedom.

1. Warning against spiritual relapse our Lord said, "Remember Lot's wife." Now, no Christian will question that a divine admonition was embodied in the ancient story of Lot's wife being turned into a pillar of salt for looking back to Sodom after having been brought out by angel-hands; or, that our Lord's use of the record is supremely impressive and true. What remains for discussion is whether our Lord's brief allusion to the catastrophe binds us to believe that the unhappy woman *literally* "became a pillar

of salt," as the narrative affirms, or whether it is still open to us to consider this description of her fate to be legendary rather than historical.

2. Pointing out how wordly engagements may blind the soul to coming judgment, our Lord instanced the heedlessness of the antediluvians up to the day in which Noah entered the ark. Here, again, the question is not of the pertinency of the spiritual lesson, nor of the aptness of the reference, but only whether our Lord's words absolutely guarantee the *historical accuracy* of the ancient record which describes a universal deluge, covering the highest mountains in the world.

3. Our Lord, in illustration of His own coming resurrection, pointed to the story of Jonah's sojourn in the whale's belly. The pertinence and vividness of the illustration are freely allowed ; the question is whether our Lord's use of it absolutely guarantees the *historical character* of the story, and forbids us to regard it as an inspired apologue.

4. In giving His disciples a sign when they should flee from Jerusalem, our Lord refers to "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet." There is some reason for doubting whether the mention of Daniel by name was due to our Lord ; for it is absent from St. Luke's version of the saying and from the true text of St. Mark's, and it may possibly have been an explanation added by St. Matthew. But however that may be, the question is whether the reference forecloses all inquiry into the *origin and date* of the book of Daniel, and requires that book to be received as a holograph of the historical Daniel of the captivity.

These are the four instances relied upon by Dr. Liddon in his sermon, and they are perhaps sufficient to show the nature of the debate between those who maintain that the Jewish tradition about the Old Testament is enforced on us by our Lord, and those who claim freedom of inquiry into its critical and historical problems.

As probably few of your readers have as yet had an opportunity of seeing Dr. Westcott's "Hebrews," I hope you will allow me to call attention to a few sentences which will be found at the very close of the volume. He says : "It is likely that study will be concentrated on the Old Testament in the coming generation. The subject is one of great obscurity and difficulty where the sources of information are scanty. Perhaps the result of the most careful inquiry will be to bring the conviction that many problems of the highest interest as to the origin and relation of the constituent books are insoluble. But the student, in any case, must not approach the inquiry with the assumption—sanctioned though it may have been by traditional use—that God must have taught His people, and us through His people, in one particular way. He must not presumptuously stake the inspiration and Divine authority of the Old Testament on any foregone conclusion as to the method and shape in which the records have come down to us. We have made many grievous mistakes in the past as to the teaching and character of the Bible. The experience may stand us in good stead now . . . . The Old Testament, as we receive it, is the record of the way in which God trained a people for Christ, *in many parts and in many modes*, the record which Christ Himself and His apostles received and sanctioned. How the record was brought together, out of what materials, at what time, under what conditions, are questions of secondary importance . . . . Every result which can be surely established will teach us something of the manner of God's working, and of the manner in which He provides for our knowledge of it."

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—Pray allow me to set "Presbyter" right. He says that we, the old-fashioned orthodox, represent our Lord as endorsing the Jewish traditions of His time. On the contrary, He never mentions them without condemning them. If the Rabbins taught that Jonah's history was a myth, our Lord taught the contrary. The whole object of "Presbyter's" letter is to make our Lord's authority of no value. If not, I do not know what he is aiming at. Of course, as a child, our Lord's knowledge grew. After thirty it is a different matter. He knew that one future date was hidden from Him. This does not prove that when He delivered His decisions He was ignorant of what He thought He knew.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE.
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

DR. LITTLEDALE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—Allow me, with your usual courtesy, to make a few remarks on "B.'s" letter in your issue of the 22nd ult. "B." says "Dr. Littledale quotes the Black Rubric perfectly, correctly, and makes no such ascription as that attributed to him." Admitting this, does not "B." perceive that Dr. Littledale's definition of Rome's present doctrine and the Black Rubric are identical? This remains for me to show, and to do so I must quote Dr. Littledale's words : "*Now* the received teaching is that no physical change whatever, of which the senses can take cognizance, is effected by consecration, but that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before. This is the Anglican doctrine, that 'they remain in their very natural substances,' expressed in other but equivalent language." Now, it all depends to what the word "they" refers. Does it refer to "all the accidents of the bread and wine," or to the words in the Black Rubric, "the sacramental bread and wine." It must refer to one or other ; and from the way in which the words are quoted by Dr. Littledale from the Black Rubric, "they" must stand for "the sacramental bread and wine," the sentence in the Black Rubric being, "the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances." The question is then, does it by so doing make a complete change in the sense, or does it make no change at all? This is the point—namely, whether it is the same to say "all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain in their very natural substances" and "the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances." There can be but one very natural substance of either the bread or the wine ; and all the accidents of either can only exist in that very natural substance. If this be true, and no body can exist without its own accidents, then it is just the same to say, "all the accidents of the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances," and "the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances." For if not, either, parts are not equal to the whole, or the whole is greater or less than the parts. Does it, then, follow that Dr. Littledale's definition of Rome's present doctrine and Anglican doctrine agree?

Yes. But is it a true definition of Rome's doctrine? Most emphatically, no! Rome always asserted, and is bound to it, that all the accidents of the bread and wine remained unchanged by consecration, but that the substance of the bread and wine was changed; so how could it be Rome's doctrine *now*, that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, after consecration, remain in their very natural substances; or, which is the same thing, that "the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances?"

An opponent may say Dr. Littledale meant, when he says that all the accidents of the bread and wine remain in their very natural substances, that they remain in their reality. To this I reply, prove that they have any reality or substance apart from their very natural substances. Rome never held that any substance whatever remained, even were it possible, that the accidents themselves could have a distinct substance, different from that of the object, of which they are the accidents. To the idea of their standing alone, with their substance gone, being the effect of a miracle, I reply: miracles are contrary to nature, and are only real so far as our senses can take cognizance of them, and therefore cannot be urged in this case, as the asserted effect is not apparent to our senses, nor can it be proved by them.

No doubt different theories about transubstantiation have arisen from time to time; "B" in his letter states, I think, four. But transubstantiation has had the formal sanction of the Church of Rome, and until that sanction be formally withdrawn, it is, and will be, essentially Rome's doctrine.

INQUIRENS.

DO WE AND ROME AGREE AS TO CORPORAL PRESENCE AND ADORATION THEREOF?

SIR,—This is the real point between Dr. Littledale's teaching and me—all else is beside the mark. Which of your readers cares a pin about what "B." or I say, or even about what Dr. Littledale said, except only that he is held up for canonization as a model theologian? If no one protests, Romanists and Dissenters will say that the Anglican Church backs him up in his Jesuitical dishonesty. So long as Romish Catechisms and other authorised formularies maintain with Trent, no one can say that Rome has changed. But I need not talk of what was held by some before Trent. I take Dr. Littledale's statement of the present Romish doctrine. He says, p. 9 of "Words for Truth":—"Now the received teaching is that no physical change whatever of which the senses can take cognisance is effected by consecration, but that all the accidents of the bread and wine in the Eucharist remain as they were before." This, as far as it goes, is a most exact statement of present Romish doctrine. So far we are agreed. But now comes the pinch—now comes the difficulty. The doctrine of Rome, which is that the substance of the bread is gone, being changed into that of our Lord's Body—this doctrine is to be made out to be the same as ours, "expressed in other but equivalent language." But our doctrine is, that the bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances. How anyone can attempt or pretend to make out, that the *absence* of a substance is the same as its *presence*, this is beyond my powers of conception. This is the case exactly. The Prayer Book says that the bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances. Rome, on the contrary, says that the substance of bread is totally gone. Can contradiction be more plain than this? But let us see how Dr. Littledale sets about this task—to make black white. Having plainly and most correctly given Rome's doctrine, that all the accidents of look, &c., alone remain after the substance has been changed, he goes on: "This" (Rome's doctrine) "is the Anglican doctrine, that 'they remain in their very natural substances,' expressed in other but equivalent language." Now, we have Rome's doctrine, that the accidents alone remain unchanged; and we have our own doctrine, that the substances of bread and wine remain unchanged; and we are gravely told that one is the same as the other. If Dr. Littledale did not mean to say that the Black Rubric teaches as Rome does, that only the accidents remain, I do not know what he meant by saying that both Churches use "other but equivalent language." "B." tells us that all Dr. Littledale meant was that the Black Rubric states that the bread and wine remain still in their natural substances. This is what Rome denies. So Dr. Littledale proved that we teach the same as Rome by stating that we teach the very opposite. Can absurdity any further go?

I have read and re-read "B.'s" last sentence. Of the priest, the editor of the *Catholic Press* for March, 1888, "B." says that the priest has it that the quotation from the Black Rubric, "they remain in their very natural substances," means that the accidents of the Eucharistic elements so remain. "It," "B." goes on, "means no such thing. The antecedent of *they* in this citation is the bread and wine. Anything else is nonsense." Why, this "nonsense" is the very nonsense that the priest was saddling on Dr. Littledale, who was proving, or trying to prove, that all that the Black Rubric said are unchanged, are the accidents, whereas what the Black Rubric really says are unchanged, are the very substances. How "B." can have misunderstood the priest is to me inconceivable. His—the priest's—words are as plain as words can be, and perfectly unanswerable. As to "such writers as will say or contradict anything," I leave that for those whom the cap fits. "B." hints that priests would, and do, contradict Trent. But that goes for nothing, if they really do so. No one can prove the fact. But if so, they are no worse than many of our own clergy, who speak, not secretly but openly, against our Black Rubic and the Fourth Article. I have read "B." over again. Much I do not understand. All that I do I have answered. "B." has tried to prove Dr. Littledale honest; but, if so, he has only made him out a fool, and so I leave it. The *Church Times* professes to be able to state Romish doctrine. This week it says that Rome holds that our Lord's Body is present with its accidents. If so, it has two sets of accidents at the same time. This is incredible, if not impossible (see Cobb's "Kiss of Peace," p. 118). But I don't believe that that paper knows any more of Roman teaching than it does of the Anglican, which it grossly misrepresents every week.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE *St. James's Gazette* says that the Bishop of Manchester's new Divinity School (*Scholæ Episcopi*) will open on the 22nd inst., with nine students for certain, and possibly twelve.

REV. CANON BENHAM ON PEACE EFFORTS.

THE question has occurred to me more than once, "I wonder whether anybody is connecting the Peace Society with the spirit of cowardice, and supposing that the decline of the war spirit means poltroonery." I reply that the world wants more courage and not less, that the want of it lies at the root of many of our troubles and anxieties.

The young men lounging at their clubs, military and civilian alike, finding their congenial occupation at the gaming table, and, growing *blasé* with that, plunging into the depths of vice, is a sight which might, nay, which does, make the angels weep. It is their very manliness which the mashers are throwing away. How much happier would they be, how much stronger society would be, if they would throw themselves into the great battle of Armageddon, of truth against falsehood and shame, of kindness against oppression, of Christian love against party strife. It is not preaching cowardice, when we repeat St. Paul's assertion that Love is the more excellent way.

From our church door, you may see the very spot where, some two hundred odd years ago, Wm. Penn stood and preached Peace to the London citizens, at a time when it involved risk of life, the time of a corrupt Court and a licentious Society. They threw him into prison, kept him in the dark, half-starved him, but they could not shut his mouth, or daunt him. You may disagree with his principles and opinions, but you cannot call him a coward. Nobody loves Westminster Abbey better than I do, or lingers more delighted among the tombs of the great. But I do not think one of those tombs ever thrilled me with interest more than the grassy grave of William Penn, amongst the gold-clothed beeches of Jordans, when I made a pilgrimage to it, two or three months ago.

There is no need to argue this out. We are all better taught than to imagine that courage can only be manifested in a red coat and stimulated by a desire to kill our fellow men. The bloodless victories of courage, on behalf of mercy and truth and right, form a yet nobler chapter in the annals of heroism. The labours of this Peace Society form one of those chapters, and it is for this reason that I venture to ask the sympathy of my congregation for it to-day. Begun with as wide-spread a prejudice against it as there was against Wilberforce, when he formed his resolve, sitting on Holwood Hill, that he would move in the House of Commons to abolish the Slave Trade, and everybody laughed at him and thought him no better than a fool; it has come at last to make itself felt as a power, and even now nations are turning their ears to listen to its exhortations.

Ah, my brethren, how lightly have we talked, before now, about war! How we have been attracted by its stirring episodes! I have several times walked over the field of Waterloo, and read all I could get hold of about it, and mastered its details. But I saw once—they were secretly produced from a hidden drawer—I saw a set of photographs taken on an actual battlefield in the American War of 1864. That sickening exhibition showed me for the first time what a battlefield really is, and when long afterwards I heard every boy whistling at street corners that detestable "jingo" song, I knew that many a one would not sing it again if they had once seen those horrible pictures. So you may go and see in the United Service Museum the death-dealing artillery, but which of us realises what a mockery such things are to the profession of Christ's religion.

But the practical work of the Peace Society, what is it to be? How will it carry its point? I answer, first it will be a great achievement when its members go on and complete what they have already largely done, viz.:— Create an enlightened public opinion on the cruelty and sin of war.

And secondly, they will persuade the nations, and I believe some here will live to see the day, to form a permanent Court of International Arbitration, established by Treaty—that will mean the reduction of these hideous armaments and the promotion of trade and friendly intercourse among the nations.

"Peace on earth, good will towards men." Still from the lips of the Church the words fall week by week, and still are so many ears deaf to them. And, verily, so much of our Christian preaching is of things half understood, not really believed, certainly not lived; still the voice is heard crying in the wilderness, and only its echo comes back.

But the sure promise of our Master is our heritage. "*My word shall not return to me void, but shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it.*"

THE London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* hears that Canon MacColl has been in communication both with the Bishop of London and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners as to the removal of his City church, and that the rector of the adjoining parish of St. Mary-at-Hill has been asked by the Commissioners if he would consent to having the parish of St. George annexed to his cure. Canon MacColl prefers the fusion with St. Magnus the Martyr, London Bridge.

UPON the motion of Mr. J. Lowles, L.C.C., the following resolution was unanimously passed at the last sitting of the East London Church Council, held on the 28th ult., the Bishop of Bedford being in the chair:—"The Housing of the Working Classes Committee of the London County Council having invited the co-operation of other bodies in bringing under its notice unhealthy areas in the crowded districts of the metropolis, this Council begs to request the Bishop of Bedford to notify to the chairman of the said committee the warm sympathy felt by this Council in the movement to secure the better housing of the poor, and its earnest desire to co-operate to the fullest extent of its power with the committee in this important work." The Bishop of Bedford has been invited to form a committee to watch the question throughout the East London ecclesiastical district.

THE American Bishops in attendance at the Lambeth Conference having presented a cross to the Archbishop of Canterbury for Lambeth Palace Chapel as a memorial of their visit, his Grace forwarded the following letter in acknowledgment of the gift to the Bishop of New York:—"On Ash Wednesday I received the cross, the precious gift of the American Bishops to the chapel of this house, which is already so adorned by their brotherliness. I thought it was a good day for placing the memorial of our Lord's Passion upon His holy table, and I did it with humble prayer for 'the family of God,' 'all estates in His holy Church, their vocations and ministries,' and for all that are 'ignorant or contemptuous of the Word,' but especially for our Churches, between whom this cross

'given and received,' is a new 'token and pledge' of love. You will, I know, offer the same prayers when you receive this, and think of the cross in its home. The cross itself is very beautiful. In dimension and manner it suits itself exactly to the beautiful and modest lines of the ancient candelabra which now flank it on either side. Nothing could more harmonise and centre sight and thought than our religious and thorough artist, Pearson, has made this to do. It is a comfort to have it drawn by a sympathetic artist, and Barkentin and Krall's workmanship is excellent. Lastly, the quiet inscription is like a firm grasp of hand at parting; yet there is a history in each of the three lines. I know you will tell the Bishops what a feeling is given me every time I pass it. When the chapel rose first not a Christian soul dreamed of the dominion which they have won, and are yet winning, to Christ and His Church. They will say to themselves for us all, we feel with more clearness than we can say it for ourselves, 'It is a pledge of 'Αγάπη 'Ασβεστος.'"

THE Navvy Mission Society are making a change in their working arrangements. The Hon. and Rev. R. Grimston, Latchford, Warrington, will act as honorary secretary, and the Rev. C. F. Ockford, Scouthead Vicarage, Lees, Oldham, as clerical organising secretary.

IT is announced that the valuable collection of books, manuscripts, and prints, illustrating the county of York, which was formed by the late Mr. Edward Hailstone, F.S.A., of Walton Hall, near Wakefield, has been bequeathed to the library of the Dean and Chapter of York. The library, it is said, contains between 40,000 and 50,000 volumes. The Dean and Chapter of York were already in possession of two sets of local books of considerable interest. By the acquisition of that of Mr. Hailstone they have the finest collection of Yorkshire books that can ever be brought together.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Addison, Rev. J. S., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bradford.
Barrington, Rev. Ythil Arthur, M.A., Curate of St. Luke's, Chelsea; Vicar of St. Mary-le-Tower, Ipswich.
Berridge, Rev. William, Head Master of Upholland Grammar-school, Wigan; Incumbent of St. Mary's Lowton, Lancashire.
Broughton, Rev. R. E., M.A., Vicar of Prestbury; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
Davenport, Rev. Edward, M.A., late Assistant Master at Wellington College; Vicar of St. Edward's, Dorrington, Shrewsbury.
Davies, Rev. L. L., Curate of Llantresant; Vicar of Llanwonno.
Dunn, Rev. J. F. Clifton, M.A., Curate of West Hackney Parish Church; Chaplain to the City of London Hospital, Victoria-park.
Dymond, Rev. Henry Newton, B.D., Vicar of Wooton, Berks.
Ellis, Rev. H. Venn, Vicar of Stowmarket; Chaplain to the Stow Union Workhouse.
Foster, Rev. F. La Trobe, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hastings; Vicar of St. John's, Wakefield.
Frewer, Rev. G. H., M.A., Assistant Curate of Dorchester, Oxon; Vicar of Fen Stanton, St. Ives.
Goodenough, Rev. George, M.A., Chaplain to the *Trafalgar*.
Gwynne, Rev. G. F. J. G. E., M.A., Rector of Eastwell, Kent; Vicar of Potton, Beds.
Hamp, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Hundon, Suffolk.
Harrison, Rev. R. B., M.A., Curate of All Hallows', Lombard-street; Chaplain of Holy Trinity, Florence.
Harvey, Rev. E. D. L., M.A., Rector of Downham Market; Chaplain of Downham Union Workhouse.
Herringham, Rev. William Walton, M.A., Rector of Old Cleve, Somerset; Prebendary of Wedmore, 3rd in Wells Cathedral.
Hewlett, Rev. E., M.A., Rector of St. Paul's, Brunswick-street, Manchester; Honorary Secretary to the Church Pastoral Aid Society for Manchester.
Hill, Rev. Fergus, M.A., Dublin, Rector of St. Luke's, Miles Platting; Rector of Christ Church, Salford,
Holme, Rev. Arthur P., M.A., Rural Dean and Rector of Tattenhall; Chaplain to Mr. George Barbour, the High Sheriff of Cheshire.
Howell, Rev. Canon David, Archdeacon of Wrexham.
Hughes, Rev. Herbert, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Saviour's, Clapham; Vicar of St. Paul's, Clapham.
Hylton-Stewart, Rev. C. H., M.A., Vicar of New Brighton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
Keable, Rev. C. H., M.A., Vicar of Wrecclesham, Farnham.
Knapton, Rev. W. J., Vicar of Wythall, Alvechurch.
Leighton, Rev. James, B.A., Curate of St. John's, Bradford, Yorkshire; Vicar of Thornton, Bradford.
Lumley, Rev. W. F., Chaplain of Chelmsford Prison; Chaplain of Newcastle-on-Tyne Prison.
Marston, Rev. E., M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Chester; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
McKain, Rev. W. J., Rector of Parham, Sussex.
Meredith, Ven. Archdeacon, Singapore; Vicar of Criftins-by-Ellesmere, Salop.
Molesworth, Rev. Ernest Hilton, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Lancaster-gate; Incumbent of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Jedburgh, N.B.
Oram, Rev. R. A., M.A., Vicar of Ramsey, Essex; Rector of Onehouse, near Stowmarket.
Orpen, Rev. E. Chatterton, M.A., Rector of Bigbury; Rural Dean of Woodleigh, S. Devon.
Packer, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Dane Bridge, Northwich; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
Pearce, Rev. G. Philips, Curate-in-Charge of High Brooms, Tunbridge Wells; Vicar of St. Paul's, Cheltenham.
Pearson, Rev. C. W., M.A., Curate of St. Ebbe's, Oxford; Association Secretary for the East Midland District of the Church Pastoral Aid Society.
Penny, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Curate of Stoke-upon-Trent; Vicar of Christ Church, Tunstall.
Penrhyn, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of Huyton; Rector of Winbrick, Lancashire.
Preston, Rev. George Herbert, B.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Andrew's, Napier, N.Z.; Incumbent of the Cathedral Church of St. Mary's, Parnell, Auckland.
Shaw, Rev. W. H., M.A., Rector of Arlington; Vicar of Combe Down, near Bath.
Smith, Rev. Irton, Vicar of St. George's, Chorley; Vicar of Margaret's, Ilkley, Leeds.
Stanley, Rev. T. C., Chaplain at Berne.
Stephens, Rev. John, Perpetual Curate of Sunk Island, Yorkshire.
Stolterfoth, Rev. G. A., M.A., Vicar of Rainow; Vicar of Wybunbury, Cheshire.
Waring, Rev. E., Curate of St. Peter's, Fairfield, Buxton; Curate-in-Charge of All Saints', Cadney, near Brigg.
Westbrook, Rev. F. S., Chaplain of Newcastle-on-Tyne Prison; Chaplain of Chelmsford Prison.
White, Rev. T. Archibald S., M.A., Chaplain of All Saints' Church, Baden-Baden; Official Anglo-German Interpreter for that town.
Whytehead, Rev. R. Y., Vicar of Bewholme; Vicar of Madingley, Cambridge.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baylay, Rev. C. F. R., M.A., for forty-three years Rector of the parish, at Kirkby Rectory, Horncastle, on the 3rd inst., aged 84.
Blomfield, Rev. George James, Rector of the Parish, at Norton Rectory, on the 4th inst., aged 58.
Bridges, Rev. Sir Brook George Bridges, Bart., of Goodnestone, at Goodnestone Park, on the 1st inst., aged 87.
Burgess, Rev. John Hugh, for eighteen years Vicar of the parish, at Blewbury Vicarage, near Didcot, on the 8th inst., aged 71.
Perry, Rev. E. J., M.A., Principal of Trinity College, Kandy, at Ceylon, on the 2nd inst.
Plowman, Rev. John Herbert, M.A., Vicar of the parish, at Burbage, on the 28th ult., aged 54.
Yate, Rev. Charles Allex, M. A., Rector of Uppingham, Hon. Canon of Peterborough, and Rural Dean, at the Rectory, Uppingham, on the 31st ult., aged 67.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TEN VIRGINS: THE LAST DAYS OF THE CHURCH ON EARTH.

By the Bishop of MEATH.

Sermon intended to have been Preached in the Chapel Royal, St. James's, on Sunday, March 23rd, 1890.

"Whilst the bridegroom tarried, they *all* slumbered and slept."—Matt. xxv. 5.

THE most unobservant reader can hardly fail to notice how often our Saviour borrows imagery from the festivities of marriage to illustrate the joys of the Kingdom of Heaven, as though to refute, by anticipation, the slur cast on wedlock by the subsequent development of heresy in the Catholic Church. The Parable of the Ten Virgins, of which my text forms an important part, is distinguished from all others in which this illustration is employed, by its dwelling exclusively on the previous behaviour of those who expect to sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. In order fully to understand it, the usages to which it alludes, on which, indeed, it is based, must be explained, which is the more easy to do, because in the unchanging East they are still pretty nearly the same now as they were 1800 years ago, when this parable was uttered.

Attended by a troop of his most intimate acquaintances, those called in the Gospels the sons of the bride-chamber, the bridegroom goes forth in the evening to fetch home his bride from her father's house. The company, numerous and splendid in proportion to the wealth and respectability of the parties, moves on to the sound of cheerful music. The marriage ceremony takes place on their arrival at the house of the bride's father; and then the company, augmented by the female friends of the bride, lead her in procession to that house which is henceforth to be her home. Each person in the procession bears aloft a blazing torch, and as they move onward their numbers are continually swelled by such as could not assemble previously, and who are waiting here and there in expectation. Of course it is difficult, in a ceremony of this nature, to calculate the exact moment when the procession will be likely to pass each meeting-place; inevitable delays often cause the bridegroom to tarry for hours beyond the time intended. "At length," says a traveller, describing a scene of this kind which he actually viewed in India, "at length, after waiting two or three hours, *near midnight* it was announced in the very words of Scripture, 'Behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye forth to to meet him.' All the persons who were to take part in the procession now lighted their torches, and ran with them in their hands to take their places. Some of them had left their lights, and were unprepared; but it was then too late to seek them, and the cavalcade moved forward." Those who are qualified by their equipments enter the bridegroom's house, the door is shut, and the feast begins, and no attention can now be paid to the clamours for admission raised, whether by the rabble of the streets, or by those who, having failed in the respect due to the married pair, can have no claim upon their welcome.

Such is the simple and intelligible scenery of the Parable; let us now endeavour to ascertain its meaning.

The Bridegroom is obviously here, as elsewhere, the Lamb of God; the Son of Man and the Son of God; the Heir of the Great King whom the universe obeys. The Bride is kept altogether in the background; not without deep meaning, for, as she represents the Church, she evidently, in this parable, coincides with some of the characters illustrated therein. The same is the case also in the parable of the marriage of the King's Son; the guests at his wedding-feast are themselves His bride; and this explains why, in both these parables, the bride is never mentioned. She appears, indeed, but not in her perfect form—only in her inception.

The Ten Virgins belong to the class of those who wait in some convenient spot by which the procession is to pass in order to fall into their places: they do not compose the whole of the train who ultimately enter the house and sit down at the feast. Now, this appears to me to be exceedingly significant. May it not fairly indicate that they represent that portion of the Church which shall *last* join, and shall finally complete its numbers? If this be the case, then the description of their number and their conduct must be taken as a prophetic indication of the state of the Church of Christ on earth at the very time of His return.

Their *number* is the first circumstance of significance. *Ten* was the smallest number of Israëlites which could constitute a legitimate Synagogue. That the Church at the time of Christ's return should be represented by only *ten* virgins seems, then, to indicate that it shall be reduced to the lowest state, considering the vast extent of the globe and its population, consistent with the maintenance of Christianity as a visible and appreciable influence in the world. Five of them were wise, and five were foolish. Why their whole number should be thus equally divided does not so readily appear. Perhaps it is intended rather to indicate the contrast of wisdom and folly most clearly and emphatically, than to give an accurate

statement of the proportions they shall hold towards each other. They had all brought lamps with them, and these lamps were all alight at first. So far there was no difference; but the wise had made provision against the delay which might take place, whilst the foolish had neglected this precaution; the wise had brought oil in their vessels along with their lamps; the foolish had brought neither additional oil nor, it would seem, vessels to put it in. And, as the parable hinges on this circumstance, let us enquire what is the meaning of the burning lamps and of the oil by which their flame is fed.

Light is everywhere in Scripture the emblem of purity, of truth, and of knowledge. *Fire* is the emblem of zeal, of love, and of devotion. God Himself is described to us as light, in which is no darkness at all. The second of the triple benedictions by which the High Priest put the name of Jehovah on his people is, "the Lord make His face to lighten on thee, and be gracious unto thee." Christ is the effulgence of the glory of Him whom no mortal hath seen or can see, who dwelleth in light unapproachable. And the condemnation is that when this Light came into the world, and shined in the darkness, which could not comprehend it, men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. In the blazing lamps, therefore, we see at the same time the illumination and the ardour and devotion of the Christian temperament.

Oil, too, is everywhere significant in Holy Writ. The oil with which the Jewish High Priest was anointed, with which the King of Israel was consecrated, symbolised that Holy Spirit which was bestowed measureless on Christ, the Eternal High Priest of an eternal covenant, the King whose Kingdom hath no end. The official title even of the Redeemer is the Messiah or Christ—*i.e.*, the Anointed One. We, therefore, behold in the lighted lamps and the oil which is to feed them emblems the most appropriate of that knowledge and love of God which are as inseparable from each other as fire and light: of those influences of the Spirit which can alone maintain that sacred flame. And here comes in one of the important lessons yielded by the parable. The *foolish* virgins, as well as the wise, had their lighted lamps and a certain quantity of oil within them, but they had made no additional provision of oil in case of a more than usual delay. Now, taking that view of the parable which, as you have seen, appears to be demanded by its scenery and circumstances, understanding the ten virgins to symbolise the professing Church of Christ at the time immediately before His second advent, though without at all narrowing that time unduly so as to make it disproportionate to the vast space which has been, and the still vaster space which may be, interjected between the first and second comings—the coming of the Saviour and the coming of the Judge—taking the ten virgins as representing the Church in the closing days of the present Dispensation, what may we gather from this description? coupled as it is with the further statement that, whilst the bridegroom tarried, they *all*, wise as well as foolish, slumbered and slept?

I think it is difficult to read the New Testament attentively without being struck with the difference between the feelings of the first Christians and our own regarding the second coming of our Lord. We hardly ever look forward to it, I fancy; with the exception of a few enthusiasts, death seems to be the boundary of our view. The first Christians, on the other hand, appear to have thought very little about death. All such considerations were absorbed in the expectation of that great event which to us has all but vanished out of sight. So startling is the contrast between them and us in this respect that we are tempted to think that the Apostles even may have misjudged the long vista of the future, and failed to recognise the distance of its perspective, though, when brought face to face with the exaggerated and breathless expectations of his Thessalonian converts, St. Paul reminds them of the stupendous development of wickedness he had taught them must precede the second advent, a development which would surely require no little time to grow and ripen, while the author of the second epistle commonly attributed to St. Peter, expressly tells the believers that so long would be the delay that scoffers would challenge the promise of Christ's second coming on the very ground of the long-continued sameness of everyday existence. The Apostles, therefore, could hardly entertain such expectations of an almost immediate advent, and yet, strange and inconsistent as it seems, all their aspirations, all their warnings, are directed to that day and founded on it. When we should exhort men by the near approach of death, they exhort them by the near approach of judgment. When we should cheer the sincere but flagging Christian with the thought of his departing hence to Christ, they cheer him with the thought of Christ's returning hither. In no respect is the habitual tone of exhortation in the New Testament more singularly contrasted with that which prevails amongst ourselves than in this particular. For whom is the crown prepared? For all them that love the Lord's appearing. When will our adoption be complete? When Christ shall descend with the shout of victory, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God, and we, whoever of us are alive and remain, shall be caught up to meet Him in the air, and so shall be ever at home with the Lord.

Here, then, is an attitude of mind we, with our habits of thought and feeling, are almost constrained to call paradoxical. A deliberate conviction that thousands of years may very possibly elapse in the slow ripening of the counsels of Him with whom a thousand years are but as a day, and

yet an ardent expectation of an event which must take place at some future time, though when it will take place none can tell. A realisation of this event, so intense as to throw all the intervening time, be it long or short, completely into the background. The Church *then* was the Ten Virgins *before* they all slumbered and slept—before the long delay had dulled their first eager and vivid anticipations. The Church now—what is she? Is she not the same virgins, all alike, wise as well as foolish, buried in the gradually deepening sleep of fatigued and disappointed expectation? And taken thus, is not that very contrast to which I have adverted between the habits of thought displayed by the New Testament and those of our own day—is not this very contrast *a proof of the truth* of this parable and *of the Divine prescience of Him who spake it?*

God, my brethren, is more merciful to us than our theories and systems are. He does not tax us beyond our powers. He does not "demand day labour, light denied." He knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are but dust. The weariness of the overworked body, the strain of the overwrought mind, the exhaustion of long-baffled expectation sinks at length into a foretold—a not forbidden—slumber. The present and, perhaps, still more the future attitude of the Church as regards Christ's second coming, is due to infirmity much more than to iniquity. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak. Once the disciples slept for sorrow. The Church now sleeps from hope deferred. So far as her Master's second advent is concerned, there is hardly a symptom any longer of either wish or expectation. The hymns in which we chant it are unreal to us. They do not express our actual feelings. The references to it in our services produce no answering thrill. This state is one which preachers in general seem half afraid to notice, but it is symptomatic and important. And I wish to call your special attention to it, as being predicted in this parable, and therefore as being another proof of the certainty of that very event to which it has dulled us. But even in this slumber of exhaustion and discouragement, there is still a difference between different members of the Church. Some there are who, even in spite of it, have made provision for that future event which has almost passed out of their recollection. The wise virgins slumbered and slept; but they had taken oil in their vessels with their lamps. It is possible with the psalmist to say, "Mine eyes fail for longing"; to say, "How long, O Lord? for ever?" to be almost without hope, as most Christians in this age, so far as my experience reaches, seem to be, and yet to have made due provision for the maintenance of the sacred fire by continually, even in the darkest and most slumberous night of half despair, invoking God as David did: Cast me not out of Thy presence, and take not Thy Holy Spirit from me! It is possible to maintain the spark of Divine life and love by the constant quiet prayerful unpretending discharge of daily duties, even though these duties be discharged, not in the cheering and invigorating light of day, but in the gloom and dispiritment of the fast falling night, in which each sound is more and more hushed, each spiritual voice more and more faintly heard. "I sleep, but my soul waketh," may be the motto of such persons in whom *conscience* takes the place of *expectation*, and who are sustained, not so much by the animating promises of the Gospel, as by its elevating principles.

Yet this state is not merely a state of discouragement; it is a state of danger. Had the virgins not *all* slumbered and slept, the foolish might have perceived their lack of oil before it was too late. But as they never woke until they were startled by the midnight cry, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye forth to meet him," so they knew not how far they had degenerated in the graces and in the life of the Spirit till they felt, at the critical moment when faith was to be turned into sight, that their lamps were going out, their faith, their love, their zeal expiring for want of that ailment of spiritual aid which they had neglected to invoke.

The parable has thus two distinct aspects, the one of warning, the other of encouragement. It cannot, methinks, but encourage us, in the evil days on which we have fallen, to find the very drawbacks under which we labour all described and predicted long before; to see that the Lord, who so long delayeth His coming, has taken into merciful account the effect which that delay must have even on the wise virgins—even on His sincere and earnest disciples. All things are naked and open before the eyes of Him with whom we have to do; and this thought is as full of comfort to the sincere though feeble Christian as it is of terror to the false believer. The mind of man is, to a very considerable extent, the creature of the age in which he lives; only to the highest is it given to outstrip that age; to none to be entirely beyond its influence. If, then, we feel some of that discouragement of which I have been speaking weigh heavily upon ourselves; if the distant perspective of future facts seems lost in baffling gloom; if no sound of the expected coming falls on the straining ear; if the overflowings of ungodliness we see around us in open denial or secret questioning make us afraid; if at times we feel as though the very foundations of the great deep had broken up, and sure footing were lost in things pertaining to eternity; in all these states of, sometimes with more finely constituted minds, almost paralyzing perplexity, let us remember who it was that said, "While the Bridegroom tarried, they *all* slumbered and slept"; and let us take heart, as knowing that the sleep of exhaustion, of discouragement, of miserable uncertainty, is yet not the sleep of death, provided only the conscience has been kept tender

and the flame of love has never been suffered to expire. If the Psalmist could say that when he contemplated the prosperity of the ungodly his steps had well-nigh slipped, if he felt the moral difficulties of God's providential government with such overpowering strength that his faith nearly sank under them, we need not be ashamed if, when to moral are superadded intellectual difficulties, a like effect is sometimes produced upon ourselves; and we may assuredly be comforted by the thought that all our difficulties and perplexities will ultimately be cleared up, provided we are sincere in the pursuit of truth and in the practice of righteousness. For "he that willeth to do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."

Many things seem to indicate that a period of great tribulation, intellectual and spiritual, is coming on the world—a period of tribulation of such stress and agony that the faith even of the elect shall almost fail. Such dangers are not to be met by ignorantly denouncing them, and by cursing those who almost or altogether succumb beneath them. There is a woe pronounced on those who make the heart of the righteous sad when God had not bade them do so; it may be as mischievous in some cases to speak nothing but menace and denunciation, as in other cases to speak nothing but peace and safety. The true tone is struck by the Prophet when he says, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked," a text which may safely be inverted, and taken to imply, "There is no condemnation to the righteous." And in the eyes of God, righteousness consists, not so much in accuracy of belief, as in sincerity of purpose. It is to the pure in heart that Christ promises that they shall see God. Yea, though they be weary and heavy-laden, not merely with the burden of sin, but with the burden of doubt, let them but come to Christ and He will give them rest. In this very parable He shows how thoroughly He can appreciate the case of such; nay, more, he shows that their case has been long before provided for; that it has long before entered into His vast and inscrutable plan of government; that plan by which not merely the wrath of the wicked but the slumberous discouragement of the good is made to serve ends which we know not fully now, but shall, perhaps, know hereafter.

One end of it we do indeed already know. It is *the trial of our faith.* That trial, St. Peter declares, is far more precious than gold, though tried by fire. The soul itself is raised and purified by the very things which seem at the time to depress and even to contaminate it. Its wrestling with doubts and discouragements, its almost stifled and inarticulate cries for help and mercy, its struggling feebly onwards in spite of temptations to which the fiery trials of the first Christians are little comparable—all these things, most distressing at the time, are educating it for something higher. The man would often be glad to keep the simplicity of the child, but he cannot; he must put away childish things, and so he becomes more useful though less happy. Just so, the Church, as she advances onwards to her term of earthly existence, is continually advancing in various knowledge; each age has something unknown to former ages; but increase of knowledge is but increase of sorrow and of temptation. The golden age of simplicity is gone, and the iron age of research and discovery and invention is distracting, dividing, and fatiguing us.

But, whilst the parable gives needful encouragement to the sincere and earnest, it offers an awful warning to the careless. The foolish virgins were not more blameable than the wise for slumbering and sleeping—for yielding to that weakness of the flesh which so often accompanies the overwrought spirit. But they had made no provision of oil, and, therefore, when they were roused by the proclamation of that event of which oblivion for a time had seized on all alike, they were utterly unprepared to welcome it. Their lamps were going out for want of oil, and it was then too late to replenish them. Each individual is a microcosm; each Christian represents some phase of the experience of the Church at large. The special dangers of the last portion of the Church's earthly life are reflected in the dangers of the last part of each Christian's life. Early zeal—early piety—how often does it not tone down as life advances into carelessness, undevotion — positive irreverence! And then when the summons comes, which in one shape or other must come to all, they find that they are unprepared. There is no power even to implore the renewal of the grace that has been lost. Neither can their fellows aid them; for in what concerns the soul, there is no vicarious piety; nor can anyone transfuse into another his own graces and convictions. No man can by any means redeem his brother. Each must be convinced for himself. Each must be converted for himself. Each must love for himself. The Church may accompany us with her prayers to the dread threshold, but she cannot cross it. In that moment we are face to face and alone with God. We seldom feel this now, but there must come a time when we shall all experience it—when we shall each of us either trim his lamp to a brighter flame as he steps into the unutterable joy, or see it expire and leave him in that outer darkness which no ray of certain hope can penetrate.

At a recent meeting of the Council on Education for the diocese of Chichester, the Bishop in the chair, Mr. F. Whitcombe was appointed organising master for the diocese. Mr. Whitcombe, who was educated at Cheltenham Training College, is now the master of the schools in connection with Christ Church, Eastbourne, which he has raised to the highest state of efficiency.

THE CONDITIONS OF CHRISTIAN DISCIPLESHIP.

By the Vicar, the Rev. J. P. SANDLANDS, M.A.

A Sermon Preached in Brigstock Church, on the First Sunday in Lent, 1890.

"If any man will come after Me, let Him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me."—Matt. xv. 24.

THESE are words of truth, for they are the Saviour's, and He was truth—the Truth. They are absolute and admit of no toning down. They are paramount and must not be explained away.

But, to understand them aright, we need, and must have the Holy Spirit's guidance. We can examine and know the things in nature only under the light of the sun. We should know nothing of the things about us, however good our sight, if we always lived in the dark. And so we can know nothing of spiritual things, however much we may feel after them, unless we seek and obtain the Holy Spirit's light and leading. Let us always pray for this light. Guide me, O God, with Thine eye, for Thy Son's sake! Let this ever be our prayer.

The text contains the conditions of discipleship. In this way it indicates what are the things which a man must do to be a true follower of the Lord Jesus. It is, therefore, of the first importance that we should understand it, and not only so, but understand it as the Saviour meant it. But it is misunderstood and misinterpreted. Perhaps it is not too much to say that few texts of Scripture have had their meaning so perverted by misinterpretation as this. It will help us very much, under God's blessing, to get a right view of matters, if we take the clauses of the text and consider them in order as they stand. There are three clauses: (1.) Let him deny himself, (2.) Let him take up his cross and (3.) Let him follow Me. Each of them is essential to Christian discipleship. We will now try to ascertain what they mean.

(1.) Let him deny himself. This means that denying self is an element absolutely necessary to Christian discipleship. What is it to deny self? The words in the Greek are ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν. We may regard these words as fairly translated by our English words, "Let him deny himself." There is no fault with the translation. But the words in English have two ideas attached to them. The first is, Let him deny himself, and the second is, Let him deny *to* himself. But they will not and cannot have this second meaning in Greek. If this second meaning had been intended another word ἑαυτῳ would have been used. Let him deny himself, then, and not Let him deny *to* himself, is the proper interpretation of the text. And so denying self, and not self-denial, in the ordinary sense of the word, is the thing inculcated here.

But what, then, is denying self as distinguished from self-denial? and why is it so important to mark the difference?

Denying self implies two very important particulars: (1.) That there is no healthy state or healing power in us, and (2.) That there is all that we need, and must have, to be found in the Lord Jesus. I need not say, because it is so clear, that these thoughts, implied here, cover the whole of the relation which the Lord Jesus holds to sinners as the Saviour of their souls. We cannot exhaust these thoughts if we would. We will not make the attempt. We will quote a little. Matt. xviii. ii. "The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost." A thing which is lost, as I need scarcely say, does not save—cannot save itself. But the Lord Jesus came to save sinners; and so sinners are lost. They have no help in them. But there is help in the Saviour. "Thou hast laid help on One that is mighty." And so the Apostle could say of Him, "He is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God by Him." While then the sinner cannot save himself, the Lord can save him. These truths are implied in denying self.

But these truths are the bases of another. That other is, That the sinner must come to the Saviour. The sinner must not only acknowledge that he cannot save himself and that the Lord Jesus can save, but he must seek salvation at His hands. His prayer to the Lord Jesus must be "Save, Lord, or I perish. I cannot save myself; but Thou canst save me. God be merciful to me a sinner."

This is the meaning of denying self, The sinner refuses to believe that there is salvation in self, or in man, or in a community of men; he believes that there is salvation in Christ. He seeks salvation from Him, and from Him alone.

But this is not the meaning that is usually attached to these words. The second and the wrong meaning is the one they generally bear. Let him deny *to* himself. And that man is the one who fulfils the injunction, that refuses to take the many little pleasures he could otherwise enjoy. He, for instance, obeys the Saviour's command, who, though he likes meat, eats fish. And yet the Apostle says, "Meat commends us not to God. The kingdom of God is not in meat and drink." God did not place man in this beautiful world to refuse to partake of the many things that His bounty has provided. Oh, but should a man abuse the things of this world? We answer, no; but that question is not under consideration. The question is not, "How is the soul ruined?" but "How is the soul saved?" To deny self is the first step. But this strange interpretation, has enervated the Saviour's words, nay, it has destroyed their true meaning.

But how came it about that this foreign meaning has been imported into the words? The answer

is easy and two-fold. It arose (1) from the juxtaposition of the words, and (2) from idea of merit which clings to the human mind. The placing together of the two commands, "Let him deny himself," and "Let him take up his cross" largely accounts for the mistake. The latter command has been regarded as an explanation—an amplification—of the other. The cross suggests suffering, and so to deny self must do so too. Then who, that is human, does not like to feel that he has much that is commendable? Poor humanity! It must do something. Yet, what can it do? And here are the causes of the mischief. Judge ye, whether these things are not so.

Now this denying self is not only what the Saviour meant, but it is in harmony with the teaching of Scripture everywhere. There is no warrant anywhere in Scripture for this view, generally held, of self-denial. In Rom. vii., the chapter in which the Apostle represents the working of the two natures in the *ego*, he does not for a moment admit that he has denied himself anything when he has refused to be governed by the corrupt nature. Far otherwise. "Who shall deliver me," he cries, "from the body of this death." He denies himself all good who submits. In other words, and to put the matter briefly, He denies himself, who refuses to be God's servant. He denies himself all that is just and true and holy. Whereas he who conquers, by God's help and blessing, his baser nature, possesses all that is calculated to produce joy and blessedness both here and hereafter.

We have dwelt on this point thus much because of its importance. I hope the matter is now perfectly clear. Let us now proceed to our next point.

(2.) Let him take up his cross. This means let him accept the conditions of salvation. There are conditions. We cannot enter fully into an examination of those conditions, but they may be arranged under three heads (α) burdens, (β) responsibilities, and (γ) duties. The cross is more suggestive of sufferings, but it involves all these. It involves burdens. How much is to bear from the world, the flesh, and the devil? How much from friends and foes? How much from relations and strangers? We all have our share and we know it. Then the responsibilities are many. Every talent, whether it be a gift or a temporal possession, is to be devoted to God's service. We are responsible to God for the use we make of everything. This is why the Apostle says, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And then what a round of duties—duties to oneself, to one's family, to one's neighbour, and to one's country. Besides all this there is that involved in the worship of God. Aye, indeed, the Christian has a cross to bear! And it is by no means a light one.

"Oh, but," some will answer, "men have this cross whether they be Christians or not." This is only partly true. Christianity makes life real, makes the cross real, and intensifies all its characteristics. So real is it that the Apostle exclaims, "Who is sufficient for these things?" And another says, "Cast all your cares"—take the work only—"upon the Lord." And the Saviour says, "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest."

Yes, the Christian's cross is a heavy one. That is clear from many circumstances. But, thank God, the Christian has not to bear it alone. "I have trodden the wine-press alone." This was true of the Saviour; but it is not true of the Christian. "I will never leave thee. I will never forsake thee." This is the Christian's experience.

But if the Christian's cross be a heavy one, the worldling's is heavier. None know this so well as the Christian. He would not exchange his cross, heavy and hard to bear though it be, for the never-so-light cross of the irreligious man. Then what must we say of that imposed by the Jewish religion? And what again when we estimate the cross imposed by the religions of the heathen? Or again when we compare it with the moral philosophies invented by the teachers of ancient and modern times. We do no more here than indicate what, if we be other than Christian, there is to bear. And be it remembered, in any other religion than that of the Christian, no one touches the cross by way of relief, so much as with the tip of his finger. Whereas on the Christian's part it is always said, "My grace is sufficient for thee."

(3.) Let him follow me. The Saviour's path was through much suffering to a throne. It is through much tribulation that we enter the kingdom. The Saviour's progress then is so far a type of ours. There are steps up to heaven. The Saviour has trod them. We must follow.

But there is a difference between His path to glory and ours to heaven. "Perfect through suffering." This is true absolutely of the Lord Jesus. It is true only in a modified sense of us. He was perfected as a Saviour through His own suffering. And it is by His suffering that we too are perfected. Our own sufferings contribute but little here. At best they can only serve as means to draw us nearer to Him.

What then is the meaning of following Christ? Ask another question. What was his object in coming here? It was to accomplish the work the Father had given Him to do. "I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished?" "I must work while it be called to-day, for the night cometh when no man can work." The Lord Jesus fulfilled his mission. He left nothing undone of all the Father had given Him to do. "Lo, I have come to do Thy will, O God." And, unlike so many, He could say, "It is finished." That is it, the Saviour's is a finished work.

Now ours is to follow Christ, and to be like Him. We have all a work to do. "I have finished my course," said the Apostle. Do we wish to be like Him? Then we must set heaven before us, and as the Saviour did the Father's will, so we must do His. But His will is that "where He is we may be also." His will is that we should be like Him. His character must be our character. "Christ in you the hope of glory." It is Christ's to prepare heaven, and to make—rather to be the way—thither, ours to have His character when we enter there. In other words, we must strive to be holy as He is holy.

But holiness is a progressive work. It cannot be conjured, as by a magician's wand, into being. It grows as we grow. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect." And we are not perfect. We have a great work to do. So the Apostle bids us, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do." It is urgent work, important work, work that cannot be neglected, that cannot be put off. Without holiness we cannot see God. This is our work and this is following Christ.

These then are the conditions of discipleship—denying self, bearing the reproaches, and seeking to be like Christ. The conditions are not light; but they are reasonable. Heaven and life and immortality, and joy and peace and love are the rewards. We will not consider the alternative. There should not be one here, or anywhere, who does not readily accept the terms. Is there? Then is he to be pitied indeed? Let us hope better things of you, for then there will be pleasure in briefly setting forth those things which will serve to help you to do all your Lord and Master wishes.

(1.) Take the Saviour as an example. He came not to do His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him. His delight was in it. This blending of the will with the Divine is the source, at one and the same time, of infinite peace and infinite power. What can we not do when the Lord will is behind it? "What wilt thou have me do?" This was the starting-point in the Apostle's life. It nerved his arm and heart for noble deeds. "I determined to know nothing among you, but Christ and Him crucified." He would not, and did not know any will but Christ's will. This is the secret of power, God's will paramount. And here take the Saviour's submission as your great pattern.

(2.) The second help I would recommend is God's word. Food, wholesome food, nourishes and strengthens the body. Without food we die. We do not require, as a rule, to be urged as to the necessity of taking food. It is only when we are ill and have no relish that the nurse needs to press upon us the necessity of eating and drinking. We have no appetite. The soul is too often sick—sick for want of food. Would that matters were otherwise! Our work would be easy. We should need then only to present the word of God. You would gladly partake of it. We occupy a position too much like that of the nurse and have to urge you to take the food. Friends, you know the matter stands thus with you. Why is it? Why is your soul sick? Disorders come upon the body, for the most part, by inattention to its proper wants, too many from not regulating the food and the exercise, from not attending to matters of cleanliness and rest. So it is with the soul. But, while we surfeit the body with too much food, we too often starve the soul. These things ought not to be. We urge upon you the necessity of reading your Bibles and listening to the preaching of God's word. Feed your souls with the "Bread of Life," and with the "Water of Life."

(3.) And then let me press upon you as a third great help the necessity of prayer. Prayer is the Christian's proper element. Birds fly in the air. Fish live in water. The soul thrives in prayer. Pray, friends, pray. Fish would die if they were long out of water. It is not safe for the Christian to pass many hours without prayer. It is not right to prescribe for any one exactly and rigidly in this matter. And so I should not like to say how long the Christian should be without speaking to his God. And yet we have authority to speak definitely too. The Apostle expresses the point beautifully, and no doubt he spoke from experience. He says, "Pray without ceasing." We are safe in our proper element. We are safe while we pray. But there is no safety in neglecting prayer.

But let us pray in the Spirit and with the Spirit. Our prayers are too often fruitless, because they are our own. We forget to ask for guidance here. The disciples said, "Lord, teach us to pray." Thence we learn. "Lord, teach me, even me." Let me, by Thy Spirit's guidance, pray acceptably! Oh, for more of the Spirit of prayer.

"Lord, teach us how to pray aright,
With reverence and with fear,
Though dust and ashes in Thy sight,
We may, we must draw near.

We perish, if we cease from prayer;
O, grant us power to pray;
And when to meet Thee we prepare,
Lord, meet us by the way."

THE *Record* hears that the Rev. A. R. Cavalier, vicar of St. Paul's, Cheltenham, has been appointed secretary of the Indian Female Normal School Society. Mr. Cavalier worked for ten years in India in connection with the C.M.S., and was subsequently an association secretary of the society, which he has now rejoined in a higher capacity.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1890.

THE CLERGY AND THE PLAY.

IT would be very incorrect to say that the clergy and their families had in past times been closely connected with the artistic professions of music and the drama. On the contrary, "Church and Stage" were avowedly at daggers drawn, the former regarding the latter as both perilous to morals and the embodiment of frivolity, while the misjudged artists felt a pitiful kind of scorn for that narrow mindedness which so perversely refused to see in their vocation anything that might be good or useful. Now, however, *nous avons changé tout cela*. Some of our leading actresses and vocalists are the daughters of clergymen, and you can scarcely go to any respectable theatre without seeing several clerical collars among the audience. What is the reason of this change? Is it that the tone and character of the works performed have been raised to a high pitch of excellence, and there is now nothing to be dreaded that is unwholesome or unimproving? Surely not. "In the days of old" Shakespeare's plays were studied in the Vicarage and the Dower House, and were considered, with few exceptions, to be the only branches of the histrionic art in which it was expedient to educate the young people. Now, they are not satisfied without serving an apprenticeship in the stalls or dress circles of the numerous theatres devoted to sensational pieces, while one or two visits in the course of their career to a Hamlet or Macbeth at the Lyceum are esteemed sufficient solid material for all requirements. If there were objections to the playhouse fifty years ago, there are much greater ones to-day. And yet the clergy countenance and visit these performances as they never thought of doing formerly. Between the Church and the Stage there must always be a gulf fixed—in so far, that is, but only in so far as the aim of one is to appeal to the good instincts, of the other to the evil passions, of mankind. No amount of actual or metaphorical handshaking can bridge over this chasm. But since good and evil are ever to be found in both, and both require purging, while each may learn wisdom of the other, they have a common ground which can be maintained without the interference of any artificial "guild." What, then, should account for the presence of the clergy at our theatres? It is true that the scenery, dresses, and attendant paraphernalia are vastly superior and more perfect than they have ever been, and the spectacular displays are works of art in themselves worthy of a visit. It is true there are occasional revivals of old favourites, which have their own peculiar attractiveness, drawing the older ones for the sake of the memories they evoke, and the younger ones to catch the reflection of the tastes and feelings of a former generation. But while these things may doubtless draw together many of the clergy, they are, we would fain hope, second in importance only. May it not well be due to the desire to study human nature, for which the playhouse and the concert room afford great facilities, indicating, as they must do to the thoughtful observer, which way the tides of men's passions are carrying them? We are bound to confess, on the other hand, that the object aimed at is too often mere amusement, in the easiest and lightest possible form. Not seldom, we fear, is the visit to the theatre, prompted by the desire to please some lady friend who wishes to see the last novelty under escort of an agreeable curate. Revivals of popular pieces, too, have a drawback. Unless the principal parts are played by the same cast they fall short. We know of a clerical visitor to the Novelty Theatre, lately who had taken his sisters to see *Our American Cousin*. A brother parson some years his senior sat next to him, and actually shed tears when Abel Murkett appeared. "What is it, friend?" asked the young man. "He may be a good actor," was the reply, "but Chippendale created that part, and no one else can do it as he did." Just so. You can have but one Sothern, and Jenny Lind has no double. Before the days of amateur theatricals, when charades in the back drawing-room were in vogue, and Tom Moore's Irish melodies were sung by the reigning *prima donna*, it was a difficult matter to know what London "show" (as Artemus Ward would say) we might take our wives and daughters to without actually going to the theatre. At this juncture there appeared at the "Gallery of Illustration" that admirable combination of music and acting known as "Mr. and Mrs. German Reed's Entertainment," which has now for the space of some thirty-four years furnished one of the stock sights

of London. It is neither theatre nor concert hall, but partakes of some of the best features of both. The cast is small but well selected, and Mr. Alfred Reed's ability fully maintains the reputation gained by his parents. The pieces rendered are necessarily light and ephemeral, and the plot only surface deep; but what is lacking in this respect is made up for by really clever acting, bright and tuneful music, and graceful dancing. As the principal members of the cast are permanent institutions, it certainly is to be deplored that revivals are rare at St. George's Hall, the successor to the old "Gallery," and that in consequence much charming music by eminent composers is consigned to oblivion. The continuous current of fun that pervades both the "First Pieces" and Mr. Corney Grain's "Sketches" is exceedingly fresh, and the political element is altogether excluded. This is the only place of dramatic entertainment which the priests of the Romish Church are permitted to frequent, and we are told of a certain Anglican bishop of venerable aspect who at the conclusion of a performance once remarked: "Thank you. I have not only been amused, but also edified." We can assure our readers who may be coming up for the approaching May Meetings that two hours spent at St. George's Hall will afford them more pleasing and sensible recreation than double that time passed at many of the theatres in London.

PAULINUS OF NOLA.—A STUDY OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

By Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester.

I.

As we look back towards the origins of Christianity, from a point of observation in the nineteenth century, we experience, with regard to the more distant ages of time, the same effect which is produced in contemplating very remote objects in space, as, for example, the stars. We fail to perceive the enormous intervals parting persons and periods, which seem to our eyes almost contemporaneous. Thus it happens that many persons still speak of the six first centuries as the Ages of Primitive Christianity, and include their famous writers in one class under the name of the Christian Fathers, forgetting entirely that even the fourth century is enormously distant and different from the first. During the whole of the intervening period, everything Christian—opinion, dogma, worship, organization, law—was in a state of constant change. Some regard this change as a legitimate development of the Gospel's and the Church's own original elements, others as a gradual embodiment and assimilation of foreign ingredients, derived from the Jewish and pagan environment: but none can deny the fact of the change.

This development or change was most rapid in the fourth century. The Church entered upon that age under the ban of the empire, from which it was suffering bitter persecution; it closed it as mistress of the secular power, and a persecutor of its former tyrant. It commenced the century with a confused and undetermined theology; it ended it with its own original Hebrew ideas modified, arranged, and systematised through the application of the terms and methods of Greek dialectics. It arrived at the Fourth Age with an organisation already inspired with imperial ideas, and moulded on the system of the empire, but not yet nearly completed; it had acquired before its close a hierarchy of numerous grades modelled on the imperial ones, and verging gradually towards the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, whose coming autocracy might already be foreseen; and with the foundations laid of a code of ecclesiastical law, despotic in its spirit, an imitation of old Rome. It entered upon this period with a simple worship, intensely averse to the externals as well as to the essence of idolatry; it ended it with an elaborate ceremonial, borrowed chiefly from the pagan religions, in which a number of heathen practices and ideas were embodied. It began the age strictly monotheist; it had become at the end of it polytheist and idolatrous. Lastly, it entered upon this period with a very strict and even puritan morality; and it left it with its moral rules relaxed in order to facilitate the entrance and the retention of the pagan masses within its pale.

In a word, during this century, while Christianity won its final victory over paganism, it was itself conquered by that which it subdued. As, in earlier days, the material victory of Rome over Greece was followed by an intellectual and æsthetic victory of Greece over Rome: so the conquest of paganism by Christian doctrine and Christian morality, supported at last by the material force of the later emperors, was accompanied by an infusion into Christianity of most of the externals, and many of the ideas, of æsthetic and polytheist paganism.

No single man contributed more to the paganisation of Christian worship than Paulinus of Nola. He had little influence over the other developments. He was not like Ambrose, a great prelate—a man of business, an organiser, a statesman, a legislator: nor, like Jerome, a scholar of the first order: nor like Augustine, a theologian at once acute and profound. His sensitive temperament, tender conscience, and delicate frame unfitted him for public life. Though possessed of ample leisure, and living close to the Greek cities of Southern Italy, he never mastered the Greek language. His theology consisted of little more than imaginative interpretations and applications of Scripture texts. But he was an æsthetic, with a highly developed taste for art, and for everything which is picturesque in ceremonial, so that he enjoyed a function with all the zest of a modern ritualist, and thought that no offering was more acceptable to God or to a saint, than a splendid basilica full of relics and votive offerings. His view of religion was essentially polytheistic. For him the man Jesus the Christ had receded again into "the light which no man can approach unto," and become merged in the *Pater Omnipotens*, to the destruction of His nearness, and the obscuration of His perfect humanity. Beneath the threefold Deity, there existed for him a whole pantheon of subordinate gods, apostles, martyrs, confessors, quartered in all the world, amongst whom the mediatorial functions were distributed, and to whom the powers of the Almighty were delegated, for the assistance of such votaries as might invoke their patronage. And he transplanted freely usages and ceremonies from the old religion into the new, only striving to purge them of their immoralities. And this was, in his hands, the

mutual action of the conquered and the conquering religion. Christianity adopted the poetic ideas and picturesque practices of paganism, and strove, with some success, though also with many failures, to inspire them with the spirit, and to spread over them the influence, of her own pure morality.

The time was now long past when Christianity sprang to light amongst the fishermen and carpenters of Galilee, and was carried through the world by cosmopolite Jewish tradesmen and handicraftsmen. It had become the aristocratic and fashionable religion. It predominated in the best society of the provinces, and claimed at least half of the senate, and a large majority of the fine ladies of Rome. Its prelacies, affording the only free careers that yet remained to aspiring men amidst the gradual dissolution of the secular government, were competed for by the rich and noble. And a plebeian origin had become a positive reproach and impediment to a rising ecclesiastic.

The family of Paulinus was rich and distinguished, possessing large estates in Campania, Aquitaine, and Spain. Both his father and his mother were of consular rank, their families having produced persons whose names had been inscribed in the imperial calendars, as holders of that highest dignity to which a subject of the Roman empire could aspire. They seem to have been Christians of the more secular kind, for their children were not baptised in infancy, and their sons were sent for education to pagan professors, of whom the most distinguished was the poet Ausonius. The subject of our sketch was born at Bordeaux, and the chief part of his early life was spent in and near that place, which was, in those days, a wealthy, and cultivated, and thoroughly Roman city. But visits were also made to the family property at Nola in Campania, a place which possessed a church and shrine dedicated to Felix, a saint and confessor of an earlier age, around whose memory mythic legends had already had time to form. On one of these visits, while yet quite a boy, Paulinus had seen proofs of the saint's supernatural power, which made him for life his constant votary. Of what kind these proofs were, will be shown from examples selected from those Natal poems, in which our hero annually glorified his patron.

His birth and talents laid open to him the highest offices and dignities of the State, and, at the early age of twenty-three, he was appointed consular for Campania, an office which conveyed to its holder the right of being preceded by lictors, with the rods and axes, which symbolized the power of inflicting capital punishment. He rejoiced, when his term of office expired, that the axes which he resigned were unstained with blood, and that he had been able to build a hospital near the church of Felix, and to lay out a road for the use of his pilgrims.

(*To be continued.*)

THE Rev. Studdy-Studdy, junior curate of the church, has been appointed parish clerk of St. Mary's parish church, Lancaster, in succession to the Rev. J. J. Lewis, resigned.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has nominated the Rev. Arthur Jervis, now curate of St. Andrew's Worthing, for special work on the Mission to the Assyrian Christians.

Reviews and Notices.

"JEHOVAH - JESUS: THE DIVINE APPEARANCES." By G. F. Townsend, D.C.L. London: Nisbet & Co. 5s.

THIS work is a history of the Divine revelation in and through the Angel of the Covenant. Its object is to prove the identity of the Angel Jehovah under the old dispensation with the God-man Christ under the new. History has for its object either the narration of events in mere chronological order, or the tracing up of the consequences of certain events and their bearing upon future generations. It is much easier to do the former than the latter, especially when, as in this case, the gradual development of a *doctrine* is set forth. We are not surprised to find that this treatise puts into the hands of the general reader a very clear, consecutive, and interesting account of the progress of this greatest of all revelations to mankind—the foundation and explanation of "God manifest in the flesh." The learned author of the "History of the Town and Borough of Leominster" has in these pages done more than gather up and condense; he has treated one of the most controverted articles of the faith without the least savour of the spirit of controversy, using only such quotations from Scripture as are warranted by the *facts* which he brings to bear on his argument with striking point and force. The book owes its origin to an accidental conversation with a Jewish Rabbi, who said that he would become a Christian if he could be persuaded of the identity of the Angel of the Covenant with the Lord Jesus. We may then well say that a similar proof should convince the Unitarians also, and we cannot recommend this work too highly for the purpose of making the truth of the matter plain to them. It would, perhaps, have been an advantage if the chapters had been headed, not only with a summary of their contents, but also with references to those passages of Scripture containing the account of each Divine appearance.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DR. LITTLEDALE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—Your correspondents who remark on my letters about Dr. Littledale's exposition of the present view taken by Romanists of the Eucharist, continue under misconceptions. If I did not make myself plain before, let me repeat, that in the "Words for Truth" its author neither quoted our Rubric wrongly, nor meant to quote and apply it wrongly. It was an error of the editor of the Romish newspaper, an error either stupid or uncandid, to attribute such an application of it. The argument in that pamphlet is, that the notion of *substance* has died out, and that material things, the elements of the Eucharist included, have not any such thing as substance, but have no qualities except their accidents; and that this is universally, if sometimes only tacitly, recognised. Therefore, the Transubstantiation doctrine, although nominally adhered to, and although the old terms are still used, has virtually dropped. The difference between the present Romish

view and that of Protestants concerning that sacrament is not the same difference that there was between Romanists and Protestants 300 years ago.

This has long been familiar to me, and the reason that it is so must be evident to every one acquainted with the mediæval philosophy—or what passed for as such—and its disputes. Bishop Berkeley dealt the last and crushing blow at the ridiculous fiction of a substance in material things distinct from and supporting, as it was said, their accidents; and now no one with any information out of a lunatic asylum is to be found who maintains the old Realist doctrine. The whole of what your correspondents say on the subject of Transubstantiation makes one suspect that they know very little about this, or have never heard of it. But let them talk to an ordinary Romanist, and ask him, if he uses the term substance, what he means, and they will find that he means nothing, and is using the term not to express an idea, but to express the want of an idea.

For all this—and here I am, perhaps, presumptuously stating my own view, not based on anything of Dr. Littledale's, or any one of that school—the difference between us and Romanists concerning the Eucharist is as fundamental as ever, although not the same as formerly. There lingers among the vulgar of that communion an impression of a material corporal presence of God, a superstition that goes much farther than Transubstantiation, which was not in itself absurd, or perhaps even illogical, so long as the notion of *substance* was accepted. There is also among them all a degree of reverence towards the sacrament and its elements that goes perilously near to idolatry. Beyond this, there is their doctrine of the Mass, still as living as ever; the doctrine, that it is a sacrifice for the living and the dead, to propitiate the Deity and to atone for sin. This is vitally contrary to the true Protestant doctrine, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and a representation (not a repetition, but a representation) of our Lord's surrender of Himself to death. It is the Christian Passover, antitypal as the Jewish was prototypal. We remain as distant from Romanists about this as ever.

If either of your correspondents thinks he has proved the late Dr. Littledale to have been either ignorant, foolish, or dishonest, I have but to say he has not succeeded, and is not likely to succeed in so proving. A little knowledge of the subject on which one writes often saves such mistakes.

B.

CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

Sir,—One extreme leads, by revulsion, to the opposite. People are now told by Ritualists that no sins are forgiven unless confessed privately to the priest. So they fly into the opposite extreme, and scorn all private confession and absolution. The Prayer Book holds a middle ground between the two extremes. No one need confess his sins to any but God in private, and in the general confession in Church. But, if anyone cannot quiet his own conscience, but requires further comfort or counsel, the Prayer Book invites such to open his grief to a clergyman, that from him he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness. This advice is introduced by solemn words, "because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy and with a quiet conscience: therefore, if there be any of you who cannot quiet his own conscience," and so on, as above. Opening one's grief means laying before the clergyman the cause of one's disquietude. This may have an ill name as auricular confession, but it is provided by the Church, not as daily spiritual food, but as medicine for those who require it. In his late Pastoral, the Archbishop of Dublin has described this auricular confession and absolution as medicine for the doubting, but as poison if used habitually. So far for the difference between occasional voluntary confession and that which is forced on people as necessary to salvation. In Edward's First Book, at the end of the above advice, comes what is very useful at times when the question is debated—"requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession (in Church) not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest; nor those also, which think it needful or convenient for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God and their general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men's minds or consciences, whereof he hath no warrant of God's word to the same." Ritualists talk of Edward's First Book; well would it be if they would mind what it here says—that we should not judge those who refuse auricular confession.

But I was also to explain what is meant by "the benefit of absolution." Some scoff at the thing altogether. But so does not the Prayer Book. It speaks of it as a benefit to the doubting soul. Let us suppose such a case as that of the poet Cowper, who thought himself shut out from God's mercy. Such a one is to open his grief to a clergyman. The clergyman having heard his description of his doubts and fears, is to ask him, Does he repent him of all his sins? Does he intend to reform? Is his trust, not in anything in himself, but solely in God's mercy, for Christ's sake? If the man answers to the clergyman's satisfaction, he is to say, As surely as you truly describe your state, so surely do I tell you that you are in God's favour, however much you may doubt of the same. Thus the clergyman speaks in Christ's name and by His authority; he but repeats a sentence already uttered in Heaven. Our authority for thus speaking is our Lord's words to the Apostles, "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." The Apostles could no more forgive sins than we. They could no more read men's hearts than we. Their absolution was true if the applicant was sincere, otherwise not. So it is now. It is only when a man truly opens his grief, his case, his intentions, and his trust, it is only then that he has a right to take comfort from our absolution. If his case be sound and truly described, he is to have as much comfort as if he heard the words from Heaven. Nay, more, a voice from Heaven might be a delusion. Our Lord's words, duly uttered and duly received, can never deceive. When the form of Ordinal was discussed in our Synod, our Lord's words, as used by our bishops, were scoffed at as the *fons et origo mali*. It was attempted to show that the words conveyed to the Apostles a power of forgiving sins not conferred on us. But that is now given up. It is acknowledged that the

Apostles had no such power; whilst as to reading of hearts, St. Peter confines that to God alone. There is another meaning put on our Lord's words, that of remitting Church censures. But the words used by our bishops can have no such meaning, as the remitting of Church censures lies with Church Courts alone, and is not in each clergyman's power.

Since writing the above I have seen "Lancastrian's" letter in your number of the 12th, but I think I have answered all the points of it.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE,
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

IT has been decided to form a new ecclesiastical parish in connection with St. John's, Doddington, Nantwich.

WE announced last week that the Rev. E. Davenport had been preferred to the living of Dorrington, Shrewsbury. We are informed that it is not the Rev. Edward Davenport, assistant-master of Wellington College, who has been appointed, but another Rev. E. Davenport.

THE formal election of Dr. Westcott as Bishop of Durham took place on the 11th inst. at a special meeting of the Chapter, held at the cathedral Chapter-house, Dean Lake presiding. The *Yorkshire Post* says communications have been passing between Bishop Sandford and Dr. Westcott with reference to his position as the Assistant-Bishop of the diocese. Dr. Westcott has expressed his intention to continue the arrangement now in force, and made by his predecessor. Bishop Sandford is highly appreciated in the diocese, and the decision will give general satisfaction.

THE following letter, dated "Rome, Monday in Easter Week," has been received in the diocese from the Bishop of Truro:—"My dear people—The time of our separation is nearly ended. In a few days I hope to be in England and to obtain advice as to the future—whether I may have the happiness of again taking up my work amongst you or am to have the trial of being parted from you. You have, I know, all these long months been remembering me in your prayers, but it will be a comfort to feel that you will now specially ask God that I may be rightly guided, that I may perceive and know what things I ought to do, and may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same."

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Apthorp, Rev. Charles Pretyman, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Astley, Rev. H. J. D., M.A., Senior Curate of Christ Church, Gipsy-hill; Association Secretary to the Missions to Seamen for the North-Western Counties.
Brodribb, Rev. W. Kennedy, Rector of Putley, Herefordshire.
Cavalier, Rev. A. R., Vicar of St. Paul's, Cheltenham; Secretary to the Indian Female Normal School and Instruction Society.
Coates, Rev. J. M., Curate of Lough; Rector of Welton-le-Wold, near Lough.
Coxe, Rev. Hilgrove, M.A., Rector of Baldwin, Brightwell, Oxon.
Coxe, Rev. Seymour Richard, M.A., Vicar of Stamfordham, Northumberland; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Newcastle.
Curteis, Rev. G. H., M.A., Precentor of Lichfield Cathedral.
Duke, Rev. William Alexander, formerly Senior Chaplain Lahore Ecclesiastical Establishment; Vicar of Debenham, Suffolk.
Evans, Rev. Tom Taylor, Rector of St. John's, Miles Platting; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bolton.
Hill, Rev. John Reuben, Vicar of Searby-with-Owmby, Lincolnshire.
Lonsdale, Rev. J. H., B.A., Vicar of Wall, Litchfield.
Lowe, Rev. George William, M.A., Rector of Hagworthingham, Spilsby.
Pattinson, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Patterdale; Chaplain to Mr. Walter James Marshall, of Patterdale Hall, Sheriff of Westmoreland.
Reed, Rev. Benjamin, Curate-in-Charge of All Saints', Habergham; Rector of St. Luke's, Miles Platting.
Ridley, Rev. Charles William, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Erlestoke, Wilts.
Robinson, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Ulgham, Northumberland; Rural Dean of Morpeth.
Sanders, Rev. Dr. S. J. W., M.A., Head Master of Northampton Grammar School; Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.
Sing, Rev. George Herbert, M.A., Rector of Stalbridge, Dorset; Vicar of St. John's, Derby.
Steward, Rev. Edward, M.A., Principal of the Salisbury Diocesan Training College for Mistresses.
Thompson, Rev. Joseph Hugill, M.A., Rector of Creacombe, Devonshire.
Thompson, Rev. W. Oswell, M.A., Vicar of Farmfield, Sussex; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Sussex.
Wallis, Rev. Frederick Alfred, Rector of Howell, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Burgess, Rev. John Hugh, for eighteen years Vicar of the parish, at Blewbury Vicarage, near Didcot, on the 8th inst., aged 71.
Burney, Rev. Henry Bannerman, Prebendary of Wells and Vicar of Norton St. Philip, Bath, on Easter Eve.
Butterworth, Rev. Joseph Henry, at 15, Belsize-square, on the 8th inst., aged 75.
De Teissier, Rev. George Frederick, formerly Rector of Church and Chapel Brampton, Northampton, also of Childrey Rectory, at Chichester, on the 8th inst., aged 68.
Gurney, Rev. Joseph John, at Lakenham Old Hall, Norwich, on the 12th inst.
Langton, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Wadham College, Oxford, for thirty-four years Rector of Matlaske and Plumstead, at Torquay, on the 30th ult., aged 89.
Medd, Rev. Harold Vaughan, late Curate of Cheshunt, suddenly, on the 7th inst. aged 25.
Parry, Right Rev. Edward, Bishop-Suffragan of Dover and Archdeacon of Canterbury, at St. Leonard's-on-Sea, on the 11th inst., aged 60.
Scarth, Rev. Harry Mengden, M.A., Rector of Wrington, Prebendary of Wells, Rural Dean, and for thirty years Rector of Bathwick, Bath, at Tangiers, on the 5th inst., aged 75.
Scriven, Rev. Charles, formerly Rector of Martinhoe and Trentishoe, North Devon, at Devonshire House, Shanklin, I.W. on the 13th inst., aged 75.
Ventris, Rev. Charles Herbert, B.A. of Exeter College, Oxford, and Senior Curate, at the Rectory, St. Columb Major, on the 5th inst., aged 42.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GROUND OF OUR FAITH.

By Rev. JOHN NAPLETON, Rector of Wymington, Beds., late Incumbent of Christ Church, Coventry.

A Sermon Preached at St. Michael's, Coventry, on Sunday, 21st August, 1884.

". . . Continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel."—Colossians i. 23 (Part).

WRITING to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse, the sacred penman uses these words: "You, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He (that is, Christ) reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprovable in His sight, if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel." We may, therefore, take the terms of the condition required, and use them in their hortatory form as an exhortation through the Church at Colosse unto the living members of every Christian Church.

We are to be, and to continue, rooted and grounded and settled in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, built upon Him, and abounding therein with thanksgiving. How familiar is the expression "A good grounding!" A long apprenticeship to every branch of the business in which parents desire that their children should become expert is an universal aim. The body must be thoroughly inured to its work; the mind be disciplined to revolve in a prescribed circle; all the faculties must be brought into subordination for the carrying on of life's vocation. And if the parent be wise, his first thought will be as to the selection, whether the burden be fitted for the back that has to bear it, accommodating work and worker as nearly as may be possible. Among the poor there is usually very little or no choice at all. With them, therefore, rests a somewhat difficult task; for, instead of choosing their child's path, they have to choose how they will prepare him or her for what is appointed, and beyond their power to reverse or alter. It may be that the child shows a great disinclination for its future employment. In this case the best encouragement and incentive will be to let it perceive that its elders have many things to do which are far from pleasant or agreeable. Not by constant *words*, however, or by thrusting obtrusively forward the grievances and hardships of life—not thus, that will only serve to irritate and chafe unnecessarily—but by quietly compelling the recognition of acts that involve patience and self-denial and forbearance. The opportunities for such acts will be frequent and numerous; no child who is wisely and kindly led up to recognise them can be altogether unmindful of what they cost, especially if he have natural affection for those who perform them. Try and *ground* your children in that frame of mind which sets itself to make the best of everything, and thus help to banish the spirit of discontent and complaint. Teach them that if God has engaged them to work during the heat and burden of the day, at his own appointed wage, it is not for them to complain and ask for more or seek other more congenial work. Again, in the case of those whose circumstances admit of a certain amount of choice, it behoves them to search out the ruling motive which influences the selection their children desire to make for themselves. Sometimes the attraction of companionship will be at the root of the matter; at others an admiration for the work in its *finished* state which they would have to be engaged upon in its earliest stages, those first steps being (as the young people do NOT pause to reflect) very much more irksome and fatiguing than the subsequent processes. How many thus are allowed to enter upon some attractive but unremunerative profession, such as that of an architect or a naval officer, because they show facility with their pencil or an aptitude for aquatic sports, only to fail hopelessly, having neither sufficient capital to pay their way in the overcrowded ranks, nor interest, if their talent be only fancied, to push them forward in a vocation they are but imperfectly adapted for! Or even within the sacred roll of the ministry, how often a clever youth will take honours at his University, and then think his way to honour and preferment is plain and clear; but he has soon to wake to the unexpected consciousness that the path of duty is a hard and difficult path, even amongst those who are so often mis-called "The Church," that not even the eloquence of Stephen or of Paul could save them from the stones and the scourge, and that their successors must expect likewise to be the victims of malice and hatred. Yes, the importance of selection is a primary factor in all "good grounding" that concerns our temporal affairs, and one that affords men much anxiety, and wrinkles many a brow. What then, we ask, what would you say if this anxiety could be entirely obviated? If each man's course could be made plain for him to walk in? Not to men on earth can we promise that this cloud shall be removed. It can never wholly roll by as long as men have the gift of free will and are endowed by their Maker with that talent on purpose that they may think and act for themselves. Never, I say, can it be wholly removed; but its silver lining can be exposed to all who need, and needing seek for help

and direction. "Continue in the faith grounded and settled" are St. Paul's words. My brethren, ye are not required to choose your own faith. There is but *one* faith, even as there is but one Lord and one baptism—one hope of our calling from which we must not suffer the noxious winds of doubt and temptation to drift us away—even the hope of the Gospel—a life present to us now only in faith through that blessed hope which maketh not ashamed. Our blessed Master did not come as did the heathen of old, as do the followers of science, falsely so called, and the lovers of vain philosophy, in our own day. He did not set up His doctrine as a rival and competitor amongst the many that flooded society at the time—nay, He condescended to no such indignity. He did not say, "Here is one of many faiths—a faith that has to make its own way, and commend itself to mankind as best it can;" but He said, "This is *the* faith—the *one* faith—the faith of Abraham, completed and fully accredited by the word of Divine revelation"; and His inspired Apostles answered for all men of all time the one absorbing question, the answer to which has for ever settled the point, "What must I do to be saved?" by the reply, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Having then this question of our faith for ever set at rest, if we would by-and-bye appear holy and unblameable and unreprovable in His sight, we must continue in the faith grounded and settled.

O ye servants of Christ—parents, it may be, in the flesh—children taught to know the love of Christ, have you been well grounded in the school of your one heavenly Master, even Christ? If so, what foundation has your faith? Remember what saith the Apostle: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." We all call ourselves Christians, we profess to be religious, yet amongst professing Christians everywhere there are *three* false foundations on which men try to build their faith, and so it vanishes away like chaff before the wind. The first of these may be described as faith in Christ's Church instead of in Christ Himself. The appeal to antiquity, to tradition, is set before everything. In matters of faith, as regards the interpretation of Scripture, the decree of the Fathers of the early Church is deserving of our veneration and respectful attention. But when it is presumed that their general verdict is comprehensive enough to apply to cases which have arisen since their time, and for which therefore they could never have thought of providing, this is turning the primitive fathers into apostles and prophets, constituting them divinely inspired leaders, which they never pretended to be, and giving to their writings the same authority as the canon of Scripture itself. Here is where the Church of Rome has erred. When her own writers have been proved to be mistaken, or their writings shown to be inapplicable to particular times or circumstances, down comes her iron rod of Church rule. "It is the law of the Church" is her decree, which when she dared she enforced on the rack and at the stake. And even in our own Church there are those who base their faith on their implicit obedience to ancient Church rule, and condemn those who differ from them, consequently they soon make shipwreck of such a hard inflexible faith, which refuses to believe that St. Paul was justified in ordering that he that eateth should not despise him that eateth not, nor he that eateth not judge him that eateth, since in either case they eat or eat not unto the Lord, and to Him who is their Master they must stand or fall. Such a faith as this will not give us confidence in the hour of trial; it will not support us when we stand on the brink of the river of death. The second faith, unworthy of the name of Christian, is, perhaps, most easily described as faith in *the preacher*. At the time when men were moved away from the hope of the Gospel by the thrusting upon them of an external religion to which spiritual life in those ignorant and superstitious days was scarcely at all, if ever, attached, the cry went up—and a loud cry it was too—"Who will preach unto us Christ crucified?" From one extreme men passed to the opposite, and hence arose the sects whose name is legion, and whose distinctive feature is that they profess to ignore any visible Church, and stigmatise all approach to Catholic uniformity and order as ecclesiastical despotism. But it is with our own Church of England we are chiefly concerned. Do we not all know some who say in all parts of the country that they do not know what they should do if they could not wait upon the ministry of some favourite preacher? They say he appeals to them as none other could do. This may be true in one sense, but it is a sure sign of the weakness of their faith. God's way is ever the same. If we allow ourselves to remain babes we cannot expect to be strong, our faith must be fully weaned; and when God sees that there is danger of our depending too much upon His instruments, He in mercy removes them, that we may learn to lean upon Him.

Lastly, the third kind of mistaken faith is that which centres in the *emotional* element, so to speak, of our nature. A grand Church, such as this, a splendid organ and soul-stirring music, elaborate rites and ceremonies. All these things are well and useful in their proper time and place, but we must not let our faith repose within these fragile coverings; they will be beaten down by the gales and storms of time. Our faith must carry us on to that tearless life which knows no ending. Our cry must be—"I cannot do without Thee, Thou Saviour of the lost." We must love His earthly temples because He fills them with His glory; not require earthly magnificence to enhance to us the glory of His presence. And, dear brethren, may I ask you to bear this in mind in the time now

coming? I do so, not because I have either the reason or the right to say that you think more of your Church than you do of Christ Jesus, its head. God forbid me to say or think such a thing. On the contrary, I have inculcated upon my own congregation their duty as either parishioners or churchmen to help forward the restoration of their Mother Church to the best of their ability. But I do urge you not to forget that our blessed Lord is as really present in the meanest building dedicated to His service as in the finest cathedral, and having this in your mind, to help your vicar by supporting that so-called chapel of ease where I have ministered as incumbent for the last four years. Many of you received your earliest impressions of religion at Christ Church, and therefore you may well help to support it now, deprived as it is of every privilege which it originally possessed. Your vicar is bound by law to provide services there, and I urge you to help him willingly. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." And I pray that God may prosper both His work and yours, so that a shepherd may soon be found for the sheep I am leaving behind, and also that the perseverance and the means requisite may be vouchsafed to you for the complete restoration of this, which is more fitted than any other in the county to be the Cathedral Church of a new diocese. May He, the true Corner-Stone, perform the cause we have in hand and heart, that we may continue in the faith of His Holy Name.

"AS LITTLE CHILDREN."

By the Rev. HARRY JONES, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.

Sermon Preached in St. Philip's, Regent Street, Sunday Morning, December 29, 1889.

"And Jesus took a child, and set him in the midst of His disciples."—Mark ix. 36.

"And Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven."—Matthew xviii. 2, 3.

"And He took them up in His arms, and laid his hands upon them, and blessed them."—Mark x. 16.

AMONG the lessons of the season, when we celebrate the coming of the Son of Man, not the least are those which we may learn as we look at the infant Christ. We pause before we pass on to think of the great message which He brought to the world in the fulness of His life. Some, indeed, are so affected by the sight of His infancy as to retain the babe as the finally exalted form in which the Saviour of mankind appeared, and in their veneration of Him give so permanently marked a place to the spectacle of the mother and child as to dim the vision of His manhood. But, without any exaggerated yielding to such a temptation, we can naturally and rightly ponder over the lessons which cluster around His cradle and childhood. These become the more pointed as we remember what He Himself had to say about such lessons as may be learnt from children. Some, however, are seen soon after His birth. They are suggested by the sudden prominence of little ones among the list of those who suffer for their Lord. Innocents' Day takes its place along with those which record the martyrdom of St. Stephen and the willingness of St. John to die for Christ. And this has been a favourite subject with artists, whose representations of Herod's massacre at Bethlehem have given an infamous popularity to the murder of the innocents, or pictured the awakening of the childlike soul to the joy of such as are in the company of Christ. The adoration of the Magi has also filled many a famous canvas. So, too, the flight into Egypt brings the babe into prominence. Then we have the scene of the child Jesus among the doctors, and the finding of Him in the Temple by His mother. And later on the taking of children up in His arms by Christ and His blessing them forms a group which painters have never been tired of depicting, and which always appeals to us with unfailing penetration. But more lessons about children were yet to be learnt from the attitude and voice of Christ. However profound may be the meaning of His saying that their angels always behold the face of His Father which is in heaven, we learn not only His deep concern for the young, but His use of them in teaching His disciples at all times. "Except," He says, "ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Out of the many thoughts about childhood which are suggested by that of Christ Himself and emphasized by the high place they had in His teaching, I will ask you to pause for a little while over this last. How can the conventional position of the teacher and the taught be reversed, and how can he be set to learn of the children? St. Paul said of himself that when he became a man he put away childish things, and yet there must needs be some which we should either never lose or recover if they should be lost, at the risk of forfeiting our interest in the kingdom of heaven. As we seek for an interpretation of Christ's warning to His disciples, in some respects it is obvious that no one would wish grown-up men to be like children. There are Christian graces which they cannot exhibit, and depths of feeling which they cannot reach. The sorrows, indeed, of childhood are possibly sharper than we think while they last. The bruised finger or the broken toy brings a paroxysm of distress. But the young child knows nothing of the sacredness of loss or mourning. It will play in the nursery though death has entered the house; and the rooted love of riper years is of far nobler growth than is possible in the earliest days of life. Again

children are often heedlessly exacting and imperious. It is reserved for men and women to show forbearance and self-sacrifice. Children also are sometimes unwittingly cruel and inconsiderate. Kindness to man and beast is one of the things which we seek to teach them, and they cannot be taught too soon. But in its fulness and depth it is a mature virtue. So are steadiness and endurance. We rebuke a man for the want of them in saying he is as "giddy" as a child. Again, some children, who afterwards become thoroughly trustworthy, have not always seen the value of truth. In short, there are many childish imperfections and defects which we make no great count of because children have no power to put them into mischievous force. The law, indeed, takes wise cognisance of this, refusing to admit or acknowledge their possession of responsibility in some matters till the age of twenty-one has been reached. In what sense, then, may it be well for men to be converted and become as little children?

In the first place, although their innocence in respect to some vitiating actions of life may be referred to their ignorance, there is many a man who can look back upon a time when his mind was unsullied by the consciousness of sins, the commission of which has left an ugly stain. Well is it for the young to believe that the purity of childhood may be retained, and that in its retention they may possess an incalculably precious sense of righteousness, the value of which is not perceived till it is lost. We may be tempted, and yet without sin. The man may pass out of the ignorance of childhood without the loss of its virtual innocence. And even though his memory may have been stained there is a "conversion" which removes the depressing sense of guilt, and stops him in the accumulation of self-rebuke. It cannot, indeed, undo what has been done. The scars remain though the sore is healed. But the wound may be closed; and such is the dispensation and mercy of God that as we judge ourselves we are not judged, and, so far as their destructive effect upon our position and future is concerned, our sins shall not be mentioned unto us. Here is a conversion, a return from wrong to right, which, with those who have lost the moral innocence of childhood, is required as they would apprehend the kingdom of heaven. In this respect children may be the teachers of men, and remind us of a state and standard of life which is needed in His disciples by Christ.

Again, their is a notably direct expression of thought by children. It is true that their exercise of this candour may need to be checked. There are many things which we think, but which, for various reasons, we rightly abstain from saying. And yet a child might teach us to say nothing which we do not mean. The cynic may sneeringly remark that the use of language is to conceal our thoughts. I need, however, hardly ask whether this does not suggest a radically un-Christian perversion of speech. How well it would be were people to be more straightforward in their words! Without their being rudely outspoken, what needless difficulties would be escaped, what misunderstandings would be avoided, from what mischievous perplexities would families and society be spared! How often we are led to respect a man who is frank without being offensive, whose word we feel that we can take as a true expression of his mind! What value this gives to a judgment or opinon which we seek! This word "opinion" might suggest to us another most important point in which men might learn something of children. They have no "views." They are troubled with no perplexing speculations. They are chiefly concerned with "facts." Now, though it is impossible for us to decline indulgence in any forecasts of life, though we must needs be exercised with questions which arrive in the course of years, and from which childhood is wholly exempt, we often need to be checked in our indulgence of sheer conjecture. Though reflection and inquiry are inevitable to manhood, though we may not seek relief by a sheer refusal to look at the problems of our being, how much might we be saved if we made more account of facts than of opinions! The realities of life are often obscured by the guesswork with which we entertain ourselves. Instead of trying to see things as they are, we pass on to ask what they might be, or would have been, under other conditions. Thus we lose our hold on duties, and miss the worth of the materials with which we might arrive at a true judgment. In one sense, children might hint to us the value of evidence. Though there is a profound truth in the saying that we walk by faith, not by sight, how much we might gain if we would oftener recall our minds from speculation, and exercise them more with the facts around us.

Again, children have no respect of persons. They are not blinded by high position or entangled in the trappings of office. Though men rightly learn to have regard for an established authority, and though some affect a rude contempt for dignity of station, we are mostly more affected by conventional demands than we should like to admit. We may make private protests against it occasionally, but there is a fear of offence and dread of any departure from supposed requirements of society which may become so excessive as to blunt the wholesome and natural impulses of human life. We are sometimes afraid of saying this or doing that which, if said or done, would bring welcome and legitimate relief to ourselves and others. How often a man regrets that he had not the moral courage to take such and such a course, to have been a little more plain spoken! What mistakes and misapprehensions would have been avoided, what explanations would have been rendered unnecessary, if he had only said what he believed when the opportunity presented itself! How the air is sometimes cleared by the utterance of a thought which had been (so they afterwards

fancy) in the mind of all, but which no one had had the courage to express in words! How often the difficulty of a position is increased by timidity in saying what is felt, and can really be said without offence! How much more simple an obscure matter becomes when the persons concerned have not been perplexing themselves with ingenious preparations for their conduct when it should come to be finally faced! There is a saying of Christ's which has a very wide application outside the circumstances of which it was spoken, and which bears on this thought. Once He told His disciples that they should be brought before kings and rulers for His sake, but that they should not premeditate what they should say. It should be given to them in that hour when it arrived. And so there is an instinctive simplicity required for the meeting of many trials of all sorts, great and small. Be simple, straightforward, and honest. So shall the path be made clear. So shall light, which is Divine, be shed upon our way, and the best end be reached. This agrees with the procedure by which a just verdict is sought in our courts of law, where the witness is solemnly bound to speak "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." We may well pray, "So help me God" to do this in all matters, at all times, without favour or fear. And this direct uncalculating simplicity of speech is just one of the things in which men may well learn of children.

Another lesson which they teach is trust. Natural relationship begets confidence. The little child believes in its parent with unquestioning acceptance of that which it is told. An infant's love is blind. Sometimes, alas! its eyes are opened all too soon. At first it hangs upon even a drunken mother, though presently it grows into premature experience of sinfulness. With all, indeed, a child shows a readiness of faith which we cannot sully by deceit without risking the sentence of Christ: 'Whoso shall offend one of these little ones, it were better for him that a mill-stone were tied about his neck and he were cast into the depths of the sea." Let us take heed how we despise or undervalue this confidence. It is an example to men of the faith we may have in our Father which is in heaven. God bids His children to trust Him. Jesus uses common human experience to support this call: "If ye, being evil, know how to give good things unto your children, how much more will your Heavenly Father give good things unto them that ask Him!" Here is assumed that faith which all may learn of the young. When we have learnt all that can be known by us about the dispensation of God, and the working of His laws, there remains the need of artless trust when, like a confiding child, we simply rest in the Lord. There are times in which we can see our path, there are those in which we can only say, "Not my will, but thine be done." There should be none in which we fail to have confidence in the supremacy of righteousness and truth, though we may be unable to explain the whole business in hand, but are guided by the Father's silent voice, heard in that of conscience. As the earthly parent speaks to his child, so, with supreme authority, does God speak to us; and except in this respect we be as little children, we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. There are occasions in which manhood, as it were, fails, and we have to fall back upon the attitude of childhood, putting and feeling ourselves to be simply in the hands of God, who knoweth whereof we are made, and what things we are in need of before we ask Him. Here the young may teach the old, the master learn of the scholar; and sometimes even the disciples of Christ, eager to know the intentions of the Lord, and the secrets of the unseen, need "conversion," as was the case when they were disputing among themselves who should be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, and Jesus said that unless they became as little children they could not enter in. Here, indeed, may be most precisely seen a way in which youth may teach years. The special fault shown by those of His followers whom Christ rebuked was a questionable speculation about the will of God. They were assuming, apparently, that Israel would be redeemed after some fixed opinions of their own, and the chief question with them was their respective places when the fulness of time should come. Here was a doubly unwarrantable presumption. They had quite lost themselves in conjectures about the future ways of the Lord, when (with Orientally Divine illustration) Jesus did not meet argument with argument, but called a little child and set him in the midst, saying, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." So Christians might sometimes now be sharply beckoned down from the heights of surmise and theological imagination to the standing ground of simple trust.

Thus children may teach men. They display a notable frankness. They are not bewildered by a timid respect of persons. They possess an innocence which accompanies ignorance, but may be retained when the knowledge of maturity has arrived; but, above all, they show a touchingly confiding faith in those upon whom they depend. That dependence, indeed, may be rudely shocked and dissipated by neglect or deceit, but God says to His children, "Can a woman forget her suckling child, that she should not have compassion on the fruit of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will not I forget thee." Here is the lesson which we too often need to learn afresh. Here is the deepest truth in the words of Christ: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

THE Dean of Norwich is in North Italy, acting for a month, from the 13th inst., as chaplain of the new English church at Bellagio.

CORPULENCE

All persons suffering from this burdensome and dangerous state of the body, and even those developing tendencies thereto, should **CALL TO-DAY, IF POSSIBLE,** or write at once for a treatise on the subject just issued by

MR. C. B. HARNESS, Consulting Medical Electrician.

The book contains valuable **ADVICE HOW,** in a simple, rational, and effective manner, without resorting either to drastic medicines, quack prescriptions, poisonous preparations, or starvation dietary, **OBESITY IS CURED,** and will be sent, **gratis and post free,** on application to the **Medical Battery Company, Limited,**

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.

(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 26, 1890.

THE IRISH LAND PURCHASE BILL.

THE Government have already gained a great advantage by the loyal way in which Mr. Balfour's proposals have been received by the whole Unionist party, with the exception of Lord Randolph Churchill. In the first place, Mr. Balfour has satisfied every reasonable man that in pledging British credit he has taken the most ample guarantees that the taxpayers of the country shall not be exposed to any risk. Cash safeguards, in the shape of licence and probate duties and tenants' insurance funds; contingent securities, in the shape of grants to Ireland by the Imperial Exchequer for educational and poor-law purposes, and rates on Government property in Ireland—all these constitute a more than triple wall of defence against the bugbear of repudiation which haunts the lively imagination of Lord Randolph. Consequently all those who have examined the Bill from the purely business point of view will support it. The Irish landowners and the Irish tenants are, of course, the two classes most materially affected. What do they feel and say upon the Bill? The landowners, as a body, are represented by a Convention elected by themselves. The Executive Committee is a hard-headed body, with a full knowledge of the facts, and determined to make as good terms for themselves and their clients as they possibly can. This Committee has considered the Bill, and has passed the following resolution:—"That, while recognising in the Purchase of Land and Congested Districts Bill an honest attempt to continue and develop the policy of increasing the number of occupying owners of land in Ireland, we consider that the Bill in its present form would be most injurious to Irish landowners, and fail to give the full measure of its advantages to the best class of tenants, and therefore requires to be amended in many important respects." In other words, the policy of the Bill is good, but in the opinion of the Irish landlords it presses hard upon them. But Mr. Davitt and his section declare it is a Landlord Relief Bill. They endeavour to excite animosity against the Government for pledging British credit in order to relieve impecunious owners of Irish land. If this were so, we should certainly not see such a resolution passed by the Irish Landowners' Convention. If landlords think they can further modify legislation in their own interests, they are perfectly justified in doing so, but it is idle for the Gladstonians to found upon the Irish landowners' action any arguments against the principle of the Bill. The principle is specifically admitted by the landlord party. It remains to be seen whether the Government can adopt the views laid down by the Convention.

With regard to the feelings and views of the Irish tenants, we know one thing at the outset, which cannot be too often recorded. The Ashbourne Act is a success because it was accepted by the Irish tenants as a practical and beneficial measure for rooting the occupier in the soil he tilled. Several Parnellite M.P.'s actually made use of its provisions to purchase their holdings. Priests and peasants alike recognised in its provisions the best possible solution of the agrarian question. For five years the tenant farmers, who have availed themselves of the advantages of the Act, have never failed to meet their engagements, and the financial machinery has worked with automatic certainty and success. And yet, in the face of these well-ascertained and uncontradicted facts, we are gravely told that the Irish tenants do not accept the principle of Mr. Balfour's Bill, and that if it is carried into law they will first avail themselves of the Act and then repudiate their contracts.

The answer to these objections is obvious. In the first place, the Act will be voluntary. The landowner need not sell unless he likes. There is no coercion in the matter. Consequently if the landlord prefers dual ownership he can stick to the present *régime*. The tenant is not likely to enter into negotiations to purchase with the malicious intention of waging war against the State, especially when the State has such local, national, and imperial guarantees as we have described. The bulk of the Irish tenants are Roman Catholics. The *Irish Catholic*, the special organ of Irish Catholicism, last week contained a remarkable and significant article, urging the Irish party to facilitate the passing of Mr. Balfour's Bill. It implores them, by their sense of duty to Ireland, to consider this matter as Irish representatives as well "as with the earnest determination to hurl back the libellous imputations indulged in by Lord Randolph

Churchill and others on the honesty of our people and the credit of the country."

English Radicals are in almost as precarious a predicament as the Irish Members. The principle of a peasant proprietary has been advocated by every Liberal Government for twenty years. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, wrote voluminously upon it at one time. The magic influence of ownership was once the favourite topic on which Radicals discoursed, and the concentration of land in a few hands was invariably denounced as one of the curses of modern society. Strange is the spectacle, therefore, of men who have swallowed all their old opinions, who have divorced morals from politics, and only act upon the doctrine of expediency and the *force majeure* of Mr. Parnell's pocketful of eighty-six votes. The difficulties of the Opposition, indeed, are almost overwhelming. Public opinion is against them on this Land Purchase Bill, and in all probability there will be yet many changes of front before their final policy is decided with regard to the Bill.

OVERCROWDED CEMETERIES.—In the Lower House of the Convocation of York the Archdeacon of Manchester, in moving that approval be given to the memorial to the Government promoted by the Church of England Burial and Funeral Reform Association, said that the amendment of the Burial Acts was a question which had been brought forward, and would be brought forward, whatever they might say or do, and he thought the Church should rise up and take the lead in this important matter. The Rev. Canon Hawkins, Vicar of Lytham, in seconding, said that the Statute Law now bearing on the subject of burial is scattered over some twenty unrepealed Acts of Parliament, exclusive of Acts incidentally referred to and of registration Acts, and added that the memorial was in the interest of the living and also in the interest of the faith. Archdeacon Blunt remarked that the Burial Reform Association was an excellent society, but that it would be more in accordance with the practice of the House to adopt the memorial as their own instead of giving their approval to the memorial of a society. After some remarks from the Archdeacons of Halifax and Northumberland this suggestion was adopted, and the resolution carried unanimously.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been nearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

PAULINUS OF NOLA.—A STUDY OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

BY REV. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., HON. CANON OF MANCHESTER.

(*Continued from page* 190.)

I.—(*Continued*).

AT the expiration of his office, which he held for six years, he returned to Aquitaine to his mother, and shortly afterwards married Therasia, a Spanish lady, also of consular family, and possessed of large estates. He has left, in an artless poem, an expression of his feelings at this time, and of his hopes of making for himself an innocent and happy home, with well-fed servants, a submissive wife,* and a family of children. This, however, was not to be. Therasia was long childless, and, when at last a son was born, the child died on his eighth day. Soon after this sad disappointment, an occurrence took place which is enveloped in mystery, but which appears, along with the failure of his hopes of a family, to have brought about what was called his conversion, his abandonment of all the pursuits of secular life, and his adoption of a monastic rule. One of his brothers was killed—it is unknown by whom, or how; and, from some cause which is nowhere explained, this death involved him in a criminal charge, which endangered his property, which the Rector (an official who had jurisdiction in testamentary and successional matters), actually seized, and even his life. It is hardly imaginable that a man so innocent as Paulinus could ever have been suspected of having had a hand in his brother's death; but it is also difficult to see what cause, other than some such suspicion, could have exposed him to a capital charge. However, he escaped this danger, and attributed his deliverance, like every other happiness of his life, to the protection of his patron Felix.

The effect of these troubles was so great, that he resolved, with the full consent of his wife, to give up all secular pursuits, to devote their property to religious uses, to change their conjugal into a fraternal relation, and to retire for the remainder of their lives to Nola to the shrine of Felix. We have still the poetical correspondence, in which his preceptor Ausonius tried to combat this resolution, and to hold him to the world, and he gently, but firmly, resisted his entreaties. The letters are very amiable, and very creditable, both to the Christian and to the pagan. Before he carried out this resolution, he was baptised at Bordeaux by Delphinus, bishop of that see, in about his 35th year, and, a few years later, while staying at Barcelona, he was seized by the Christian populace of that place, who compelled or prevailed upon their bishop to ordain him against his will. Such forcible ordinations were of frequent occurrence in the fourth century. A similar attempt was made at Hippo upon Pinianus, whom we shall shortly meet in Paulinus' company. Nor was the motive of the pious populace in these cases entirely spiritual. A man of wealth, when ordained, was expected, though not actually compelled, to devote his property to Church purposes, the chief of which was a very lavish and indiscriminate almsgiving to the poor. Hence the people were always on the watch for wealthy laymen of clerical tendencies, and often applied force to quicken their sense of

* Verna satur, conjux morigera.

a spiritual vocation ; nor were the bishops unwilling to yield to pressure, and accede to the popular demand.

In the year of his ordination, the fortieth of his life, he carried out his long cherished design of retiring to Nola, which he felt to be his real home. And there he spent the whole remainder of his life, thirty-eight years, in the employments that he most enjoyed—worshipping familiarly his patron saint, and solemnly God in Christ, raising ecclesiastical buildings to the joint honour of his higher and lower deities, receiving votive offerings, especially relics, for dedication ; decorating the basilicas with costly marbles, silver, gold, and jewels, and especially with pictures, then a recent innovation, which he feels obliged to defend by argument ; in studies of the Bible ; in correspondence with all the eminent divines of the period, and a large circle of private friends ; above all, in writing an annual poem for recitation on Felix's natal day (January 14th), whose return he longed for more than others did for the arrival of the turtle-doves, the swallows, and the storks, which heralded the approach of spring.

His life at Nola forms itself into two divisions, separated by that terrible event, the sack of Rome by Alaric (August 24th, A.D. 410), which was followed immediately by the devastation of Campania, and the capture of Nola itself, when Paulinus fell into the hands of the great barbarian. For the first seventeen years (A.D. 394-410), we have ample materials, in his own letters and an unbroken series of annual poems, extending to the year 406, to trace a complete picture of his employments and his feelings. But, for the twenty-one years which followed Alaric's irruption, all his works have disappeared, except two or three letters, which contain few particulars about himself. Whether that dreadful convulsion, in which numbers of his friends must have perished, shook his faith in his beloved patron saint, and dried up the spring of his easy versification, we can never know. Certain it is that he was for some time Alaric's prisoner, and was in dread of torture, which, however, he had not to endure. It is also recorded that he was invited to a council at Ravenna (A.D. 419), which he was unable to attend. Lastly, there exists a contemporary account of his death, by one who had been an attendant at his death-bed.

The life-like particulars, in which he has drawn for us his own portrait, all belong to the period which preceded Alaric. Amongst the most interesting of these is the intense affection which he felt for the legendary being, who was to him all, and more than all, that Minerva was to Ulysses, or Venus to Æneas. For him, as for those peasants to whom he ministered, Felix was omnipresent and all-powerful. At sea he had succeeded to all the powers of King Æolus and Father Neptune. When the sea had to be crossed from Spain to Italy, Felix was supplicated* to calm the winds and waves, and to prepare a rapid passage over smooth seas. If a person was sick, the holy confessor was the best physician.† Monomaniacs, who believed themselves to be possessed by demons, were first visibly tortured, and then calmed and relieved, when presented at the shrine.‡ This influence was most intense at the place where his relics were deposited, since the Holy Ghost is always present near a martyr's or confessor's bones ; but his power accompanied and preserved his votaries everywhere. This power, it is true, was not original, but only delegated, being the gracious gift of Christ his God ; but it was entirely at the saint's own disposal, and exercised at his discretion.

If we ask, who was this being, to whom Paulinus attributed so many of the powers and functions of the Deity, we find the information at our command very scanty and vague ; and (what is more remarkable) that his votary knew no more of him than we. He imagined vaguely that he had lived ages ago.* All that his legend contained was, that he had been a good and faithful presbyter to a former bishop, and afterwards his successor in the episcopal chair, and that, in a persecution, though he had concealed himself and escaped actual martyrdom, he had always confessed and never denied his faith. All his exploits were posthumous, the works, not of his living self, but of his bones. From some unexplained cause, a popular belief had formed itself, that miracles took place at his shrine. Paulinus, in his boyhood, had been an eyewitness of some of these ; and to his credulous mind the proofs of supernatural power seemed so convincing, that he adopted Felix in those early days as the patron of his life, and ever after regarded the confessor's temple as his home.

It is difficult to decide, whether this saint of uncertain period, and without a definite biography, ever really existed as a man. We feel tempted to hazard the conjecture, that he was merely an imaginary *hero eponymus*, suggested by the official title of the town of Nola. That city took part in the social war against Rome, for which offence its population was massacred by Sylla, who refounded it as a colony, and repeopled it with Roman soldiers. It was a second time colonised by Augustus, who was himself a native of the place, and who gave it the official name of *Colonia Felix Augusta Nolana*. The juxtaposition of those two epithets is very remarkable, for while Felix was the Christian tutelary saint, that city's pagan supernatural patron was none other than the great Augustus himself. He had died there in the house of his ancestors, in the room (as it was said) in which his father had died, and he himself had been born. After his apotheosis, that house had been consecrated to his worship, which was conducted there by a *collegium* of *flamines augustales*. Nothing could enable us to appreciate more exactly the difference in the genius of the two religions, than a comparison of the pagan with the Christian patron—Augustus the successful politician and consummate ruler, but selfish, pitiless, remorseless, sensual ; and Felix, perhaps a purely imaginary being, but, as such, a personification of patience, purity, unworldliness, and self-denial.

Felix had no more constant votary than Paulinus ; nor would it be easy to name a parallel instance of the complete devotion of a living man to a departed one. Many male saints have been in love with the Virgin Mary ; but, in those cases, the attraction of sex exercised its wonted charm. We think also that we remember Cardinal Manning professing an intense affection for Carlo Borromeo, and Cardinal Newman for his sweet Filippo Neri ; but none of these eminent persons ever approached our Paulinus in complete devotion to a patron's honour.

(*To be continued.*)

* Da currere mollibus undis, et famulis famulos a puppi surgere ventos.

† Orantem medici Felicis ad ipsa reduci Limina, mox illic certam reperire medelam.

‡ Fixam per tot retro secula sedem corporis.

* Natal. Carmen iii. (A.D. 396).

Reviews and Notices.

"A Memory of Edward Thring." By John Huntley Skrine, Warden of Glenalmond. London: Macmillan & Co. 6s.

This book presents us with a life-like picture of the work of the late head-master of Uppingham, and of his aims as a teacher, and is one of the most pleasing biographies which we have ever read. Unencumbered with details of time and place, it is perhaps on that account the more interesting. It does not profess to be a full biography of the events of Mr. Thring's life, which will be dealt with in the forthcoming "Biography of Edward Thring," by Professor Parkin of Canada. As a thinker he was an intuitionist, and his method as a teacher is explained by this fact. His questions to his class might more properly be called suggestions, framed so as to bring out the latent capacities of each individual. Such a method stimulates thought, and may be contrasted with that adopted by most teachers, who propound long questions, and are satisfied whenever the one correct word is given in answer. We may perhaps admit that the latter method is the only method possible in the lower forms of a public school as they are at present constituted, where there is an insufficiency of masters, and where each pupil is merely one of a crowd. But we have no doubt that Mr. Thring's method tends in the right direction, and that there would be fewer instances of failure if Mr. Thring's method were rendered possible. Every teacher should read his book on the "Theory and Practice of Teaching," a book for which Mr. Skrine's biography serves as a commentary. At any rate, those teachers, who are naturally gifted with an analytical turn of mind, would do well to supplement their method by a study of Mr. Thring's works on teaching.

This memoir admirably illustrates the way in which Mr. Thring's conversation and teaching were influenced by his philosophical views, in which he seems to us to be closely allied to Emerson. "He was, if any one, a man of intuitions. Now, you cannot have your intuitions in company; you can only report them and illustrate them. You can hardly even revise them. They do not thrive by collaboration. They are the bliss of solitude, and must be sent back to solitude to be amended. This is the reason why his conversation was more didactic than dialectical. He had grand things to say, but they issued whole and fully formed; you had not the interest of watching the gradual dubious birth and growth of a thought, the mist of an embryo conception, clearing its outline, 'a cloud that gathered shape,' as the winds of counter minds blow on it from this side and that." We would venture to suggest that the dialectical method is one of great power in the hands of a real teacher, and we cannot but think that Mr. Thring's method is susceptible of criticism. With the fact that he was a man of intuitions Mr. Skrine connects "his mysticism his depreciation of the intellectual side of life, the imperativeness of his conclusions and their impenetrability by counter-views, and, in matter of style, his love of trope, and his gift for aphorism." "Then, again, this unaccountability of the act of intuition breeds mental confidence. A judgment gained, one knows not how, has a sort of sanctity, and seems more inspired than those of which you can say 'these are their reasons, they are natural.' Much which people called dogmatic in his talk had a dignified excuse in his mysticism." In all this we see Mr. Thring's kinship with the philosophy of Emerson, and with some of Goethe's remarks on the theory of education in "Wilhelm Meister." Indeed, we think that Mr. Thring's views must have been, perhaps unconsciously, moulded by Goethe's, who wrote as follows: "Only a part of art can be taught, the artist needs it all. A man who only half knows his art is always going astray, and speaks much; a man who is an entire master of his art would prefer to act only, and speaks seldom or late. The former have no secrets and no force, their teaching is like baker's bread, tasty and satisfying for a short time; but meal cannot be sown, and seed-corn ought not to be ground." Such words as these which we have extracted from "Wilhelm Meister" sum up Mr. Thring's theories of intuition. It is the merit of Mr. Skrine's Memoir that he does not slur over the defects inherent in a system which is based on these maxims. "It is a teacher's art (says Mr. Skrine) to make answer possible, to use accommodations, to deal out truth in morsels as it can be swallowed; not, like a child at a nursery window, toss a whole crust at a sparrow." But he adds with regard to the method: "It was a drastic pressure of his will upon our minds. His cogent interrogation applied to our intellect *non lene tormentum*, it put it on the rack, forced us to intend our mind, to labour and travail with ideas." It is well for a big school that it should number amongst its teachers some men in whom the imaginative faculty and others in whom the logical faculty is predominant.

Mr. Thring's love of nature was that of the sportsman and of the mystic. He looked upon nature with the eyes of a poet, and probably found it difficult to reconcile the poetic with the scientific aspect of nature. He did not care to examine the logical grounds on which biologists gave in their adhesion to the theory of the origin of species, a theory which has in the end obtained the support of every biologist. "'Nursery babble' was his succinct account of the popular evolutionism." If he had more closely examined the theory of the evolution of species, he would have seen that biologists do not profess to be able to explain the ultimate facts on which the theory rests, and that the universe remains not less but more full of mystery and wonder in view of the Darwinian theory. We must confess that we feel more sympathy with those who try to reconcile new truths of science with the truths of moral experience.

We find it difficult to abstain from making further extracts from so interesting a memoir, and we commend the book to our readers as an admirable and life-like picture of a great teacher, in whose method the merits and defects of the intuitionist are clearly visible.

"Ex Opere Operato," etc. By the Right Hon. R. T. Warren, LL.D., Chancellor of Cashel, etc. Dublin: McGee, 1890.

In taking up this pamphlet, we will first say a few words about the author, and then proceed to consider what he says.

In the three Kingdoms, there is no one more respected in every sense, than Judge Warren. But, if we hear him, as St. Paul heard St. Peter, what more can be expected? St. Paul says, "Whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth no man's person." We need not quote Horace's *jurare in verba*

magistri nor our Lord's "call no man master." It says, somewhere in the Apocrypha, but we cannot put our hand on the words, that every man is to be heard in matters of his own profession. Now, law, not Divinity, is Judge Warren's profession. If he sets about to explain our Irish Canon 36, for instance, we would pay all due respect. But as to Divinity, why should Judge Warren be heard, more than the Chancellor, or any other judge? His arguments must stand on their own merits. We are reminded of Lord Eldon's advice to a military man, going out to act as judge in a colony, "Make up your mind, as well as you can. You will most probably be right, *but never give your reasons, you will be sure to be wrong*." So we come to the judge's reasons. In the first place, he confounds the regeneration of the services with conversion. This is a vital mistake. In neither case is conversion supposed to take place in baptism. To infants, it is impossible; in adults it is supposed already past. The judge considers the charitable hypothesis, p. 41. But, supposing regeneration to be conversion, how can it be charitably hoped that the infant has been converted in the rite? Yet the clergyman asserts the fact to God and to the congregation, implying, we are told, that regeneration means conversion. He cannot mean to assert an impossibility, All he *can* mean is that the infant has been adopted by the Holy Ghost, and embraced in the arms of God's mercy. Then turn to the case of the previously converted man, like St. Paul. For such a one, the clergyman prays that he may be regenerated at the font: and when the rite is over, he tells God, forsooth, and the congregation, that that previously converted man has then been converted over again! Preposterous! He cannot charitably believe any such nonsense, because the man has been brought up to the font on the very supposition that he has been already converted: otherwise he would not have been brought up at all. On this absurd theory was founded the Gorham decision. It says, most truly, that conversion may take place before, at, or after baptism. But this has nothing to do with the adoption in baptism, and seal of God's covenant of mercy, "an outward and visible sign, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means and pledge," never conferred, either before or after baptism, but only in the rite.

We now come to the judge's chief arguments, founded on the second answer in the catechism on Sacraments. He gives, p. 49, a Latin translation to prove that "given unto us" must refer to "sign" and not to "grace." But this translation is by a private hand, and of the date of 1660. So it has no authority whatever. He gives "*quod nobis datur*": but we may as well refer to *gratiæ*, as the antecedent, and give "*datæ nobis*." So this goes for nothing. As to the other argument, p. 49, that the comma should be before "given," and not *after*, so as to bind given to sign, and not to grace; this is utterly worthless. Even, if it could be proved where the comma originally was, it would prove nothing, because the three words "given unto us" might be left out, without the sense being the least altered, wherever the comma is placed. The whole thing turns, not so much upon "given unto us," as upon "ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." If it is a means whereby we receive the grace, that settles the whole thing. Some may say that, even then, the words merely mean that the water is the means of receiving the same, mere water; or that the whole ceremony is only the means of receiving the ceremony; but there is no use arguing against positions so absurd as these. Judge Warren, pp. 10, 15, 41, quite mistakes the meaning of the answer to the question, "What is the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism"? Answer: "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness for . . . . we are hereby made the children of grace." This is the grace, as well in the case of the already converted adult coming to the font, as in that of the infant. The judge evidently makes "the death unto sin," and a new birth unto righteousness, equivalent to conversion, p. 22. But it can be no such thing, with the fit adult, as he was converted before. It merely means being made children of grace, that is being adopted. Thus we die unto sin; sin's power to condemn us is gone; and we are born into a new state, wherein we are helped to be righteous. This is all it can mean, in both cases, of the already converted adult, and of the infant, incapable of conversion. The judge, at p. 15, speaks of unfit adults; he says truly that they do not profit by the sacrament. But he forgets that the real difficulty is with the sincere ones, pp. 20, 32, converted before. Making regeneration to be conversion, how can he say of them that they are converted at the font? This is a difficulty insuperable in his theory. The judge makes the child say that he is one of the elect, who can never perish. The words really mean only elect, in that it has Gospel light and grace, denied to others. A Rubric after the Catechism says that all children are to be taught the Catechism. But as the judge has it, that every child then declares himself to be one of the elect (p. 22) who can never perish, he makes out that these words are put only into the mouth of a *special* catechumen, and are not abstract statements of doctrine applicable to all baptized children (p. 29). At page 14 we read "the first part of the Catechism is written in the first and second person, in the form of a conversation between a minister and a child, who has attained years of discretion," so as to say of himself, I am one of the elect, who can never perish. Are boys and girls of twelve or fourteen to be required to make such an assertion? Who, then, would come to be catechized? Who would come to be confirmed? Would the judge himself make such a statement in his own person? To say that none is to learn the Catechism, though he is ordered—none till he is old enough to make such an assertion—is a most monstrous position. Let me illustrate this. Suppose there was a law that every Irish child was to be taught to be loyal to the Union; and suppose a Home Ruler judge on the bench were to say that no child was to be so taught till he was old enough to distinguish the kind of Union meant—a paper union or a union of hearts. The case seems to be very analogous.

The judge makes faith so necessary that, until the infant has it, or dying without it, he seems as much shut out from mercy as Rome makes the unbaptized (p. 23).

We have carefully studied the learned judge's pamphlet, but we can come to no conclusion except that conversion is different from regeneration; that the charitable hypothesis cannot mean that we hope for what is impossible as to infants—cannot mean that we hope that *that* is done *over again* in adults which is already past. As to the Latin translation of Dean Durel in 1660, it has no value. As to the position of the comma, it is questionable, and it is of no consequence, as the words "given unto us" might be left out without hurting the sense, all remaining as

it was until the other words are got rid of too, "ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same and a pledge to assure us thereof." As to the words *opus operatum*, they are very good to give a dog a bad name. But that is all. If God does a work, may it not be called an *opus operatum?* Was not our Lord's work on Calvary such? Does He not bind Himself to receive the penitent believer? May not this be called an *opus operatum?* Why not, in like manner, His adoption of infants, or sincere adults, conveyed in or with the waters of baptism? If Rome has any idea of magic, we have none. We call sacraments "effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by which He doth work invisibly in us" *always*, unless there is a positive resistance on our parts.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—Your correspondent "Presbyter" has narrowed the limits of this discussion to a single issue, viz., "Are we free to examine the Jewish tradition about the Old Testament by the canons of historical and literary criticism, and to modify it where the investigation shows that it is not reasonably tenable? or are we bound by our Lord's authority to accept the tradition as a matter of faith, which human reason has no right to challenge?" As to the first question, I will merely say that I ventured to state my opinion about it in a former letter; and to the second, that we are bound by our Lord's authority to accept, not the tradition about the Old Testament, but the Old Testament facts, which He referred to. The tradition, or the received current view about the Old Testament books at our Lord's time, may have been, probably was, different from that held when its last book was written, many hundred years before. And who questions the right to examine into it? With those who maintain that that tradition is enforced on us by our Lord's authority I do not number myself; and His mode of treating traditions in general leads me to think I am justified in so doing. But I do maintain that we are bound to accept as positive facts, recorded in the Old Testament and referred to by our Lord, the four instances mentioned in Canon Liddon's sermon. These are facts, historical facts, related in the Old Testament, and not traditions or current views. Were they only mere traditions the case would be quite different; and is it likely that our Lord's references to them, were they such, would not have been met by mocking rejoinders from His learned hearers, when He based His teaching on what they could answer were mere legends and apologues? No argument, it seems, could be stronger to show that they were not so regarded, than the uniform silence of the rabbis and scribes who were always on the watch to lay hold on anything to cavil at or disprove, when they might have taunted Him with basing His doctrines on such current fables. If, as "Presbyter" says, the Old Testament narratives were as a whole accepted in the letter as *strictly historical*, can we suppose that our Lord, when quoting the Deluge, Lot's wife, Daniel and Jonah, knew that they were not so (viz., historical facts); knew, too, that his hearers believed them to be facts, but not only left them undeceived, but left them to suppose that He also thought them real facts, while knowing they were not so? The Old Testament, and our Lord's references to it is one question; the tradition, either then or now, concerning the Old Testament, is a very different matter. The received or current view about the origin, structure, and general character of the Old Testament at our Lord's time was different, no doubt, from that now held, and this difference in neither case precludes discussion; but neither does it compel us to think that "Presbyter's" question, "Are we bound by our Lord's authority to accept the tradition as a matter of faith, which human reason has no right to challenge?" embraces the whole matter. For my part, I venture to think that the question should stand as follows: Are we bound by our Lord's authority to accept these historical facts of the Old Testament as matters of faith? and I put it so, because it was from the Old Testament and not from tradition, current view, etc., the four facts referred to were drawn. If any one of them was handed down *only through* tradition, then the question would be fair enough; but when each of them is distinctly recorded in the Old Testament books, and not questioned as to their reality when referred to by our Lord by those most competent to do so, it seems hardly just with such evidences in their favour to class them as mere legends or apologues.

Allow me to thank you for inserting my former letters on this subject, and apologise for the length of the present one.

INQUIRENS.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—Apart from the pleasantries of Mr. Heber Evans's last letter, which relieve the tediousness of a dry subject, and amuse myself and my friends as much as any of your readers, there is one fact on his side of the argument on which he has hardly laid sufficient stress. Briefly it is this. If St. Luke is of Greek and not of Jewish descent, as the author of the third Gospel and Book of Acts, he occupies a unique position in Holy Scripture. In the Old Testament, canonical or apocryphal, there is no book that we know of, Greek or Hebrew, from a Gentile pen. Apart from St. Luke's works, it is just the same in the New Testament; all its writers are Jews. Their style varies in purity of Greek from the Epistle to the Hebrews downward to the original Matthew. St. Luke, as a Gentile, occupies therefore an exceptional position in Scripture. Within its range there is no other Gentile author with whom we may compare him. We cannot tell from analogy what such a writer would do—I mean, how far he would conform his style to that of the recognised standard of authority, viz., the LXX, in his hands. It would certainly be *à contre cœur* that an educated man, with literary tastes, penned Hebraisms (to him barbarisms), and that he wrote less elegant Greek than he could. The *à priori* argument is that he would not do it, hence it may be argued that the exception did not really exist, and that the author was, as Mr. Heber Evans maintains, really a Jew.

Now, allowing this argument its full weight, I do not think that it is absolutely convincing. It overlooks the marvellous influence of authority. It matters not whether it be in things divine, or things human, the authority of a great master, even to his mannerisms

and peculiarities, shows itself in his disciples. The poet, the philosopher, the artist, the novelist, what a subtle influence they exert over their disciples, whose feebler originality is swallowed up in the easier task of copying, even to exaggeration, the defects and whimsicalities of their chosen master. In religion this influence is at its greatest. Our Authorised Version of the Bible of the date of King James I., with its quaint phraseology, misspelt words and mistranslations, has exercised a marvellous influence on our English tongue. It holds the field at the close of this nineteeth century, in spite of all the learning and greater clearness of the Revised Version, whose chief fault is distinctly that it departs in many places unneccessarily from the good old version; why the very sound of its wording, familiar to our ears as household words, is endeared to us by use. Its faultiness even has its charm. We scold a sixth standard boy for using "most lowest" in composition, but "most highest" is too precious to be submitted to the laws of grammar; we have laughed "thee" and "thou" out of Quakerism, while we seriously use them in the good old Book. Other instances will occur to your readers. Suffice it to say that the sanctity, which doth hedge about a sacred book, is strong enough to override grammar, philology, and modern style.

Applying these thoughts to St. Luke, we may well imagine that, the more familiar he was with the LXX., the great Scripture authority for Greek readers in his day, and the deeper he realised its influence on the rising Christianity about him, the less reluctant would he feel at adopting its unclassical and Jewish tinge, in combining, and even in rewriting, the materials which form the basis of his works. It was an accommodation of style on his part to the accepted Church authority. Where he was free to write naturally, as in the preface to his books, he writes good Greek. The rest is more or less a concession to the style of his materials, and to the prevailing religious taste of the day.

Happily there survives an epistle of the first century by a Gentile hand, in which many of the linguistic peculiarities of St. Luke appear. I allude to the first Epistle of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians. A fellow disciple of St. Paul, he was a Gentile, as his name proclaims, and he had not, like St. Luke, Jewish-Greek materials to work over. His epistle is saturated with the LXX.; quotations from it, more or less correct, fill about one third. Like St. Luke, Hebraisms appear, καί joins sentences to the exclusion of other particles; μέν occurs followed by εἶτα, and not by δέ; the use of the optative is wanting, as in St. John's Gospel, the frequent use of the hortatory subjunctive gives his style a constrained appearance, and his vocabulary is borrowed apparently from the LXX., St. Paul, St. Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Now, here we have an instance of a Gentile Greek writer, much esteemed in his day, who adapts his style to the current ecclesiasticism of his age, and his is *mutatis mutandis* a parallel case to that of the author of the third Gospel and Book of Acts. I submit it to Mr. Heber Evans' consideration.

I must correct a little error into which he has fallen respecting the number of volumes Galen wrote. It is not 300 volumes, but books, *i.e.*, treatises (if so many) that Galen wrote. The one volume before me contains seventeen such "books." It is possible with time and perseverance to read all that survives. If too slow to please my correspondent, I can only add with Horace:

"Quod si cessas aut strenuus anteis,
Nec tardum opperior, nec præcedentibus insto."

F. T. P.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Abraham, Rev. C. T., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Lichfield; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Staffordshire.
Allen, Rev. R., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, St. Leonard's-on-Sea.
Barker, Rev. Philip Chapman, M.A., Vicar of Burrow Bridge, Bridgwater.
Bullen, Rev. Frederick Lisle, Curate-in-Charge of St. Philip and Jacob, Bristol.
Burn, Rev. W. J., M.A., Vicar of Coniscliffe, Darlington.
Chayton, Rev. E. C., M.A., Rector of Beaudesert, Warwickshire.
Coates, Rev. J. M., Curate of Louth; Curate-in-Charge of Welton-le-Wold.
Cooke, Rev. A. H., Vicar of Davidstone; Surrogate for the Diocese of Truro.
Cooke, Rev. G. F., M.A., Rector of Litton; Rural Dean of Midsomer Norton.
Cribb, Rev. Arthur W., M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Stepney; Vicar of Shipley, Leeds.
Davenport, Rev. Edward, Perpetual Curate of Dorrington, Shrewsbury.
Dowling, Rev. R. B., M.A., Perpetual Curate of St. Mark's, Noel-park.
Eardley-Wilmot, Rev. E. A., M.A., Rector of Walcot, Bath; Prebendary of Wells Cathedral.
Forman, Rev. T. R., M.A., Perpetual Curate of Stanley, near West Hallam.
Griffiths, Rev. James Herbert Alexander, M.A., Vicar of Llanwrthwl, Breconshire; Vicar of Llanddewi Ystradenny-with-Llanfihangel Rhydithon, Radnorshire.
Guest-Williams, Rev. W. S., M.A., Vicar of Painswick, Gloucestershire.
Herbert, Rev. James Lloyd, B.A., Curate of Cefnlly's, Radnorshire; Vicar of Llanwrthwl, Breconshire.
Hodge, Rev. W. H., M.A., Vicar of Manaccan, near Helston; Vicar of Budock, Cornwall.
Hutt, Rev. W. W., M.A., Rector of Hockwold-with-Witton; Honorary Canon in Norwich Cathedral.
Johnson, Canon William, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Bangor; Rector of Llanfaethlu, Anglesea.
Jones, Rev. J. Thomson, Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral; Vicar of Towyn, near Abergele.
Killick, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Little Compton, Gloucestershire.
Knapp, Rev. A. H., M.A., Rector of Aylton, Herefordshire.
Legge, Hon. and Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Lewisham; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of the County of London (Alderman Sir James Whitehead).
Lewis, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Llangynog and Llandilo-Abercowin, Carmarthenshire; Perpetual Curate of Llanstephan, Carmarthenshire.
Littlejohn, Rev. C. P., M.A., Vicar of Send, Surrey.
Macdonald, Rev. J. M.. B.A., Chaplain of Bengal.
Mahon, Rev. G. A., M.A., Vicar of Leigh-on-Medlip; Rural Dean of Frome and Midsomer Norton.
Mammatt, Rev. A. S., M.A., Vicar of Packington-cum-Snibstone, Ashby.
Milner, Rev. Thomas Rogerson, Rector of East Lambrook, Somersetshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bishop, Rev. John Rees, Rector of Oake, at Balham Park-road, on the 20th inst., aged 81.
Cadogan, Rev. Edward, at Wicken Rectory, on the 16th inst.
Clubbe, Rev. James Henchman, Rector of Bexwell, at Bexwell Rectory on the 18th inst., aged 71.
Parker, Rev. William Russell, for thirty-seven years Rector of the Parish, at the Rectory, Willingale Spain, Essex, on the 17th inst., aged 77.
Sidley, Rev. John James, Vicar of Branxton, at Branxton Vicarage, Cornhill-on-Tweed. on the 14th inst., aged 36.
Swinburn, Rev. J. T., D.D., P.P.G.C., of Warwickshire, Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin since the foundation in 1864, at the Vicarage, Acock's Green, Worcestershire, on the 18th inst., in his 63rd year.
Wheeler, Rev. George Domvile Wheeler, M.A., Honorary Canon of Worcester, and R.D., at Wolford Vicarage, on the 19th inst., aged 75.

The Church of England Pulpit.

LIBERTY OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

By the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, D.D.

Sernon Preached in Trinity Church, New York, Tuesday, February 25th, being the Second in a Series of Lenten Talks to Business Men.

"If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."—John viii. 36.

TWO truths, I hope, came to us yesterday, and have abided with us ever since. In the first place, the truth that every man must advance through liberty, and not through servitude. There is absolutely no creative power in slavery. Slavery may keep a man from certain temptations or certain dangers, but it never can create in him the power of life. Therefore the hope of the world is not in deeper servitude, but in richer liberty. It is not by casting men into dungeons, but by bringing them forth into the open air, that the perfection of human life is to be attained. And this truth, that every man stands on the brink of greater, richer, and more Divine things than he ordinarily apprehends. There are chambers in every man's life which are not open, but which are just ajar and all ready to be opened, on which the touch may fall at any moment. When those two truths come together and force themselves into the channel of a man's life, then that man's life is renewed, and the man is born again. Then, moving toward freedom and not toward slavery, looking toward enfranchisement and not toward greater restraint, he anticipates the coming into his life of the power of God, preparing that life to receive the truth of God; having the greater revelation of the Incarnation, that God came into our human life to make known to it this saving freedom.

I would that, as I look over this multitude of men, I could know that every one of us had this power in him, making him capable of greater things. However he has lived thus far, however sure he is that that which is gone was but the exercise of some of his lower and meaner powers, he is conscious at this moment that there are greater powers which may be used and larger chambers which may be opened. If I could know that of every one of you, my hearers, I should go in great hopefulness into the time which I may occupy in speaking to you of the subject which I am to dwell upon to-day—that is, the Power of Liberation which comes to a man, and that power is in Christ the Son of God.

I cannot speak of liberty on two mornings, certainly, without speaking of Christ as the Great Liberator, the Power of Liberation that comes into the human life. And I want to try to point you this morning to the power of Christ, by which he liberates the human soul and sends it forth into this larger destiny. I am glad to speak of Christ, my Master, thus, because so often in Christendom it has seemed as if Christ were the enslaver of mankind, as if He went among men as He went through the Temple, with a lash, rebuking men simply for their iniquities; as if He were continually uttering the great "Thou shalt not" of prohibition, telling men what they must not do, and rebuking them for their wrong acts. This is but the subordinate message of Him who comes to us with the Gospel of Christianity. His great message is that of freedom and of a larger life; and every breaking away of any one from slavery, as I hope we shall see, is but the preliminary to the opening of some larger chamber of the human life. I remind you once more of what I said yesterday, that this is absolutely true of every man. Away with every thought in our minds that would seem to indicate that the promise of the Divine life belongs only to certain select men! It belongs to every man or to no man. And therefore, because I do know that it belongs to many men, because I humbly know that it belongs to one man, I dare to speak to every fellow-man whom I may address, and tell him it belongs to him. What shall we say, then, when we speak of Christ as the Liberator of mankind—Christ the great Giver of liberty?

We say, in the first place, that it is absolutely impossible that any man shall give to another man that which he does not himself possess; that it is impossible that any man shall open the prison door from the inside, unless he have the key in his own hand. But One comes from the outside, from the region of liberty, and opens the prison doors to those who are shut up within. Therefore, when we think of the liberty which Christ gives and of the larger life which Christ opens to us, we think, first of all, of the liberty which belongs to *Him*.

Look back with me to that Figure that stands far away in history, and which, as we look upon it, seems to come down through all the distant ages of history, from the time in which He lived, until He is present here in our own time. I do not ask you to go away from our modern life, from our nineteenth century city, with its great tumult, that you may find the Christ. I ask you only to look there, in the distance, that you may see what He was, and what He for ever is, and see all the story which is written for us in the Gospels, and see what the power of the Gospel is in our own time and place. When I attempt to enumerate the instances, the special forms, in which the liberty of Jesus Christ in that wonderful life of His shows itself to us, it seems to me that, in the first place, I dwell upon

His absolute freedom from that which is holding multitudes of us in some sort of slavery to-day. I marvel when I look back to Jesus Christ, turning my eyes suddenly from our modern life, to see there a figure absolutely free from those ambitions and that covetousness which are absorbing so much of our life. Christ cares absolutely nothing for riches or for luxury. Do you realise, my friends, the difference in which that sets Him from our daily life, and yet the way in which it brings Him to our deeper thought and understanding? He cares nothing for those things that we are perpetually pursuing. There have been others who have indicated to us something of that sort of freedom. There have been noble men in every time who have given us revelations that these things which are holding our thoughts and our time and all our faculties are not really the things which are material. There is always a liberating power when a man comes to be among us, and is free from the slavery of those things to which we are enchained; when a man, not by any mere discontent or peevishness, nor by inability to avail himself of them, but because his life is so rich without them, does without the things which it seems to us we could not possibly do without. Have you seen the man here in your own community to whom the things which you deeply valued were as nothing—absorbed in some deep issues of sound philosophy; aroused, enkindled to some noblest generosity; lifted up to the heights of some large philanthropy? Has it not stirred deep questions in your mind when such a man, absolutely liberated, has taken from his shoulders, as though unconscious of the load which He was throwing away, that burden which we are carrying every day—the burden of the riches and luxuries of human life?

The wonder of Jesus Christ, in the first place, is that that human nature, absolutely and truly human, was *absolutely free from all such desires.* It was not that they are desires that belong to modern times. It was not that they are ambitions that have been generated in the midst of our modern commercial and social life, and that they did not prevail in Jerusalem. I think that we sometimes fancy to ourselves that the people of Jerusalem cared nothing for these things. Jerusalem was a great commercial city. It was a rich city. There were rich men in Jerusalem just as there are rich men in New York to-day. There were men whose desire was to add to their money, to increase their hoard, just exactly as there are such men here in your metropolis now. There were camels waiting at the needle's eye to see whether they might not by some strange wonder pass through into the kingdom of God, carrying their covetousness with them. In the midst of these there walks the figure of Jesus Christ, absolutely free from their desires. I find nothing of scornfulness of wealth in Jesus. I find nothing of any vulgar scorn with regard to the exercise of man's powers which gather around man the comforts of life. But I do find in Him an absolute freedom from any slavery to the comforts, or luxuries, or the abundances of life. More than that, I do seem to see Him putting His hand into the very heart of this desire for riches, and plucking out everything valuable and true, and keeping that—all the noble vitality of man, all the richness of man's intercourse with his brethren—all *that* He would keep; but the covetousness after riches He is absolutely independent of and free from.

Then, when I would go on from that, I find another freedom from slavery in Jesus. There comes another part of the richness of His life. He is *absolutely free from the thraldom of sin because life is so rich and interesting to Him.* I think (and you will perhaps agree with me) that some of you could furnish me with illustrations out of your own experience which, perhaps, I will not be able to furnish out of my own. I think that one of the reasons why men hold to sin, why men go on in habits which they themselves despise, is that they are somehow afraid that there does not lie outside of that region of life anything that would interest them in existence. They think of the old phrase that has been been tossed to and fro upon the lips of men in all these years, when the young man has called it "seeing life," when he has gone into the depths of iniquity, when he has waded through the mire and slime of every profligate and degraded habit. There is just exactly the key to what I mean. A young man calls that thing "seeing life." What did Jesus Christ call "seeing life"? He lifted up His eyes, and looked abroad, and life was full of the spirit of His Father, and intensely interesting to Him, absorbing in every direction. There never came a fear to Him lest, if He were not profligate, abandoning His life to luxury and idleness and sin, the world would pall upon Him, and there would be nothing left for Him to do—nothing left for those hands that were for ever being claimed by human need; nothing left for those feet that were for ever being summoned to errands which they could not refuse, in order to accomplish which they must leave everything else behind; nothing left for those eyes to see, when there was the deeper truth of God's love and the deeper view of human nature for them to be looking into every moment. Ah! my friends, if there is any delusion in a man's soul that Jesus Christ dispels, is it not this—that life has no interest apart from profligacy, frivolity, and sin? He who knows the true interest of life enters into the freedom of Christ, and leaves the stains behind him slipping from his garments, and goes forth into the full light of the freedom of God.

Then, I think another of the great freedoms of Jesus was His freedom from those things which are perpetually holding us down because they are so subtle and binding—the *freedom from the ordinary traditions of society.* Jesus stepped right across

the traditions of Jerusalem. And yet—is it not wonderful?—have you ever thought how there is in Jesus not the least sign of defiance? He is not one of your light-blooded people who think that virtue consists in defying the conventionalities by which a man is surrounded. That is purely negative. There was the absolutely positive in Jesus Christ; and because He was absorbed in those truths which lie at the very bottom of all things, He could afford to be regardless of the traditions which had come down and which constituted so much of the life of the men that were around Him. Jesus was the great radical. Why? Because He was truly conservative. Conservatism and radicalism, far as they seem to be from one another upon the surface of our life, come together and meet, and are one at the bottom of our life. No man can be a true conservative who has not hold upon the fundamental principles and the eternal truths of the universe; and no man can be a real radical who is not observing those truths, and insisting that in them lies the perpetuity of human happiness and human goodness.

Another wonderful thing about Christ is that in His day *He was the disturber of things;* but what is He to-day? The revolutionary man seems to see Christ having no share in his disturbances; and the conservative man, as we call him—the man who desires the perpetuity of society, who is apt to call himself a Christian—simply gives all the solid conservatism that is in his life to the Church of Jesus Christ, which was once the most radical and disturbing element in our human society. What is it to-day but very often the home into which old abuses creep, and where men keep themselves quiet and dumb and blind from seeing the flagrant enormities and the prevalent needs of the time? There is the difference between the Church of to-day and the Church of Christ in His day, who carried the Church within His own divine and human bosom; who could defy the traditions by which He was surrounded, simply because He had His peculiar abiding-place within the truths of which those traditions pretended to be the embodiments, and of which they were very often the corruptions and the misrepresentations.

And so, everywhere, Jesus, as we may say in a more general way, is able to be free from the accidences of life because He is bound to the character of life, is free from regarding the circumstances of human kind. It is no effort to Jesus when He goes down the Jerusalem street this morning, and speaks to the poor man as kindly as to the rich man, and habitually gives to the despised man and the profligate and the sinner just as courteous a welcome as that which He addresses to the Scribe and Pharisee who pay Him their morning compliments. And so, because He has entered into the higher region of men, because He knows them by their character, I can see the difference come into that perfect face as He meets the man who is all mean and base and hypocritical, and then looks into the sunny countenance of him who is so open and frank that he has nothing to hide from all the world. Character is absolutely clear to Jesus, and that is the reason why the difference in circumstances is nothing to Him. And, my friend, you will never, in any artificial way, escape from the slavery of circumstances. You will never escape from that slavery until you get into some such intense valuation of character as belonged to Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ lived in the spirit of true democracy. Why? Because human nature opened itself to Him in its fulness and variety, and He saw men as they were. Therefore no mere outward disguise, no habit in which they walked among their fellow-men, could have any significance to Him. There is no absolute equality of men, but not because some men are rich and some are poor, not because some men are famous and some despised. There is no absolute equality because the range of human character is everlastingly various and different. There is no difference between the poor man and the rich man; but there is an everlasting difference between the bad man and the good man. It is only by entering into the depths of moral distinctions, and their profound and hidden meaning, that man escapes from that slavery which cringes to the one and bullies over the other, and makes him thoroughly the slave of the men whom he thinks at the time he is making his subjects and his slaves.

Now, these are the services, the liberations, of Jesus. And don't you see how radical and how true they are; how every one of them has this peculiarity about it, that he who enters into the liberty escapes from slavery by entering into the liberty? Jesus Christ escapes from the slavery of money and of luxury because His soul is absorbed in the eternal plans of God. He escapes from the slavery of the lusts and passions because His whole nature is always taken up with the nobleness and positiveness of righteousness. He escapes from the traditions of His people, because He lives in the eternal truths of God; and He escapes from circumstances because He lives in character. Jesus Christ is positive, and not negative. Liberty, and not slavery, you see entirely in His enfranchisement. I love to think of that calm figure, walking majestically because it is so absolutely calm, through the perplexed and troubled and feverish streets, as if He stood to-day and rebuked you—why? Not for doing the things which you are doing; not for being occupied with the details of life which have been thrust into your hands, and which you have constantly to do with; but for being the slaves where you ought to be the masters; for being ruled by the things which you ought to have under your control. Here He stands the poor Christ, the calm Christ, the simple Christ, in the midst of our riches and our agitation and our complexity and our artificialness and our slowness of life. Here He stands; and you have

come to worship Him this morning. What must it mean, my friends? What must it mean that you rich men have come and bowed down here before the poor Jesus Christ? What must it mean that you have come out of your gorgeous houses and have come to kneel and bow down before Him who had no where to lay His head? Does it mean that your gorgeous houses and your rich luxury is wrong? No, no! But it does mean that you have found in Him something that is greater; and unless you go away clear in the sense that He, and that which He represents, is greater, you have lost the lesson of His teaching, you have lost the essence of His life.

When you have come here, you men of complicated and disturbed and complex life, you have come to one to whom life is absolutely simple. You have come to Jesus, who knows but one problem, and that is sin; who knows but one advantage, and that is holiness. May not your lives grow clearer, so that many things will seem to you of little consequence which have seemed to you of vast importance? And you have come here, poor men, into the presence of the poor Jesus Christ, to look into the face of the best that divinity in humanity has to show; and, lo! it bears upon its features the unmistakable mark of poverty. You have found your brother in the poor man Jesus Christ. Shall not some poor man, some poor boy, go back to his work, go back to his life, knowing that in poverty there may be every dignity of human life—go back, not simply respecting his poverty, but respecting the way in which a man may live in his poverty, rejoicing that those things which he has struggled for, which he will still struggle for, are not the necessaries of human life? Shall we not, so turning away from the sight of the free Jesus Christ, enter into something which really shall be like His liberty?

But now, while I am occupying you for a few moments, may I not ask you to think something of the way in which Jesus Christ became so free? He became thus free simply because He was for ever tied to, and for ever conscious of, the higher belongings of His life. He remembered that He was the Son of God. Do you remember the story of the temptation? It is fresh in many of your minds, I know, but let me just picture to you what happened on that strange morning when Jesus, having been led up into the wilderness forty days before, and having wrestled with the devil, at last underwent His temptation. Do you not remember how He there stood, with the simple freedom which has again and again amazed, perplexed, astonished, and delighted us; and first some power (I know not whether it was some outward voice or an inward inspiration from His human nature) came to Him and said, "Make these stones bread"? Jesus said, "I will not, for My Father has promised to feed Me." Then that voice came to Him again, and, as He seemed to stand upon the pinnacle of the Temple, said, "Cast Thyself down. God shall keep Thee." But Jesus said, "I will not, for God has bidden Me to trust Myself to Him, and to do only that which he bade Me to do." And then, in some strange vision, the very Spirit of Evil said, "Bow down before me, and I will give Thee this world"—give this world, you understand, my friends, not that He might make it the source of His own enrichment and partake of its luxury—"I will give you this world that you may save it." That was what the devil proffered to Him. "I will give you this world that you may spread the work of your redemption and make it your Father's world." Jesus looked in the face of the evil vision and said, "Not even to save the world will I worship the devil. I will do no bad that good may come. Get thee behind Me, Satan." And the devil left Him.

You see the power of freedom is forever in being fastened to the heart of God; is forever in living, in walking with the Divine life of which He was a part. It is forever in the positive and not in the negative; in the great strength of the goodness to which He clung, and not in the weakness of the evil which He defied. And so it must be with us. Is there anything in His experience which can come to me? I may say, "I am the son of God. He told me so. I am the son of God with my Divine belongings, with my Divine reachings toward the higher life, with my possibilites of intimate union and close connection with Him who rules the world and from whom all holiness proceeds. I am the child of God; and therefore the life of the Child of God who is my Elder Brother may become the picture of the life which I may live, and I may enter into His salvation."

I must not keep you too long. Let me go on as fast as I can, to tell you of the story which it seems to me must burn upon the lips of one who desires to tell it to his fellow-men. If we can enter into the company of Christ, and live there, then our unknown possibilities shall open to us, and in the light of these unknown possibilities we shall be able to despise and to escape from the baser things that cling to us. Do you remember how He went snapping this chain and that chain among the sons of men whom His life touched? Nicodemus came to Him, and the creed-bound Pharisee became the faith-clad man. Christ came to the poor Magdalen, and in her sin He touched her, and she lifted herself up and was free, not only from her sin, but from the tyranny of her dark remorse, and entered into His service, and by-and-by was with Him at His crucifixion. He came to twelve plain men—plainer than almost any man in this house to-day—and touched their lives, and each and every one of those men became that which any one of us would give his life if he might become—one of the apostles of the new redemption, one of the saviours of the world.

Has there been nothing since? Has it limited

itself to the story told in those few pages? Has it not gone down through history? What shall you make of the heroisms and the martyrdoms, and of the men who have counted not their lives dear to them, that they might bear witness to the truth? What of the men who have languished in prisons and burned at stakes that Jesus Christ might do some of His work in them? In the old days they used to cry out, when they saw the Christian, "There is the coming martyr!" When the Christian looked into the sky he always saw his cross there, drawing nearer and nearer to him, sure that he should hang on it. "*Christiani ad leones!*"—"The Christians to the lions!"—used to be the cry. Is it all gone? Has heroism died out of the world? Has it passed away, this capacity in men for giving themselves to noble ends? Are there no lions for the Christian still? Ah, we think ourselves satisfied if the young Christian not merely does not go to the lions, but if we can save him from going to the dogs. Nay, surely there is in the human soul—we in this generation have seen it—a power of self-sacrifice which the emergency calls forth. I never shall remember the days of twenty-five years ago, and not know that every man I look in the face is bigger and greater than he seems to be. And when, across the self-sacrifice of those great days, which some of us remember, I see far off the greater sacrifices of those who gave themselves for the salvation of the world, and were like Jesus Christ, I am sure of this, that there are mysterious powers and depths of sacrifice in every man, ready to open when they shall be called for, only to know that they are called for every day, only to know that, not in any great disturbance that shakes the world, but in the perpetual needs, in the continual miseries, in the abundant sins of life, there is the demand for that which is in you; and you must believe it yourself, like Christ, and respond to the demands of your life, which is very often a great deal harder than the lives that men lived when the stakes were burning. The more I live the more wonderful and infinite becomes to me the mystery of human life. To be a human creature is a wonderful thing. The poorest little urchin upon the street, whom you may see when you go out has in him such a mystery. It is such a wonderful thing that he should be what he is, it seems as if the most wonderful mystery were hardly higher—that Luther, Shakespeare, Plato are hardly more wonderful than that poor urchin, who carries in mind and soul and body the wonderful tokens that he is the child of God. To respect in him and to respect in yourself that sonship of God, after the pattern and with the leadership of Jesus Christ—that is the total impulse of religion, that is the liberation of the human soul.

Ah! my friends, it must be a personal following of a personal leader. A creed can never make me believe how wonderful man is, how wonderful I am. It may tell it to me, and the words bound back again from my intelligence on which they strike. A rite or a ceremony can never, in itself, force it any further than my fingers and my mouth. But the Master, the personal manifestation of it, the Christ who is to-day that which He has been in all the ages, He who walks so humble and so strong, so free because of His absorption, devotion, and consecration to his Father—He brings it to me. And if you will let Him walk with you in your streets, and sit with you in your offices, and be with you in your homes, and teach you in your churches and abide with you as the Living Presence in your hearts, you too shall know what freedom is, and, while you do your duties, be above your duties; and, while you live your life, still walk, already walk in heaven; and, while you own yourselves the sons of men, know that you are the sons of God.

There are men in this house now who, if they went out with such a spirit as this, might be small Christs to the men whom they meet. There are men who, if they went forth to every duty, yet knowing the life that is above these daily duties, and living in it, might be revelations wherever they went. Their office boys would feel the difference if they saw them, not slaves to, but masters of, their business. Their ordinary companions, as they meet them in the place of traffic, would know the difference, if they saw them superior to the thing they did, and therefore doing it all the more nobly, all the more conscientiously, because they did it loftily, in the sight of God. May we so follow Jesus Christ and share in His enfranchisement, may we so enter into this life of liberty which sets us free from all slavery, that already the chains may drop from our hands, which we sometimes foolishly think will drop when the time of dying comes—as if there were some magic in that little thing of dying! Let them drop now, in our lives, and let us go forth into the glorious liberty of the children of God, into the freedom wherewith the free Christ makes all the obedient children of his Father free. God grant it for us all!

CHILDREN OF THE FREE WOMAN.

By the Rev. E. HERBERT JONES, Vicar of Rolvenden.

Sermon Preached at Rolvenden on Mid-Lent Sunday.

"So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."—Galatians iv. 31.

THE passage which we have as the epistle for this morning is a striking one for two reasons. First, because of the confident way in which St. Paul appeals to Old Testament history as an allegory, not indeed denying or casting any doubt upon its strict historical accuracy, but, at the

same time, maintaining that far more is involved in the inspired record than the mere recital of bygone events, and that for those who can see deeper than the historical shell in which they are enshrined, there will be found a rich store of spiritual truth and foreshadowing of future things in those stories of the patriarchal age.

And, secondly, because the lesson he draws from the consideration of the story of Ishmael and Isaac is itself a bold prophecy, which the state of things, as they were when St. Paul wrote these words, would appear to render very doubtful of fulfilment.

The Church to whom he wrote, as indeed all the Churches in Gentile cities at that day, was vexed with Jews and Judaizers, who taught that the Gentile Christian held a lower position in the Church than those who could boast descent from Abraham; and that unless they added to their faith in Christ an observance of the Jewish ritual and Mosaic law, they could not be reckoned as in covenant with God or partakers of the promises.

St. Paul, as we know, had continually during the early years of his ministry to contend with this Jewish party, and to stand up for the liberty of the Gentile converts. And in face of the strong position which they held, and the authority which they seemed to have upon their side, it required no small amount of moral courage in one even of the Chief of the Apostles to proclaim boldly the equality of Jew and Gentile in God's sight, and to withstand the influence that was brought to bear upon them to induce them to sacrifice their freedom and take upon their shoulders the yoke of the Mosaic law. But St. Paul in the passage before us boldly carries the war into the enemy's camp, as it were, and argues that not the Jewish but the Christian Church, Gentile though it were, was the true inheritor of the promises made to Abraham; the mere natural descent from Abraham being not sufficient in itself as a claim on the promises; for that Abraham's son Ishmael, born according to the flesh, had been cast out to make room for one, even Isaac, who was born not in the ordinary course of nature, but according to promise.

Thus, from the history of the casting out of Ishmael, which many would say had nothing to do with the matter in hand, the Apostle confidently predicts that those Judaizing disciples, who were arrogating to themselves the position of the only true Israelites, would eventually be cast out to make room for those whom they so despised—to wit, the Gentile Christians.

We have need to remind ourselves of the circumstances under which these words were written, that we may fully appreciate the faith, which St. Paul has, in the soundness of his method of interpreting Old Testament history, and see that he is not merely illustrating current events by the analogy of those which have gone before, but that he is actually using the Old Testament history as if it were designed solely as a prophecy of what should be afterwards, and on that interpretation proclaims what shall be the final settlement of a difficulty, in the midst of which they then were, and which seemed most unlikely to be settled in the way in which he foretells it will be settled.

Let us then glance at the interpretation which St. Paul finds in this passage in the life of the Patriarch. He points out that Abraham, the father of the faithful, to whom the promise was given, that in him should all the families of the earth be blessed, had two sons, one born according to nature, one not according to nature but by promise. These two sons then represent, one the Israelite according to the flesh, who could trace his natural descent from Abraham, and the other the Israelite according to the Spirit, who had been grafted into the family of Abraham, not according to nature, but according to promise, in the Person of Jesus Christ. As then the natural son was the elder, and for a long time considered himself the heir, so had it been now; the Jew had imagined himself the sole recipient of the promise, and when the Gentile Christian claimed a share in it he mocked and persecuted, even as Ishmael had mocked and persecuted Isaac. And these children were by different mothers, the first by the bondmaid Hagar, the second by the free woman Sarah. These two mothers then represent the two Churches, whose children the disciples are, the Jewish Church and the Christian. It was a bold thing for St. Paul to say that the Jewish Church, which boasted Sarah as mother by nature, was spiritually represented by Hagar, while the Gentile Christians were the true children of Sarah the free woman. But he makes good his point, saying that these two women are the two covenants or dispensations, the one given from Mount Sinai, amidst fire and thunderings and all that could strike terror into the carnal mind, whose children were all in bondage to a strict law of carnal ordinances; the other free, given by the silent outpouring of the Holy Spirit, unseen by carnal eyes, and whose children were bound by no such carnal law, but were under the direction of the free Spirit of God. And to make the more clear which is the true free woman, he points out that Mount Sinai is in Arabia, whither Hagar fled, and where her children even now dwell. So that the covenant given from Arabia might justly be represented by the mother of the children of Arabia, Hagar.

But what saith the Scripture? triumphantly exclaims St. Paul when he has drawn out the likeness, which he desired us to see, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman." And so he leaves this prediction to do its work, reminding his Gentile converts once more that they are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free, and exhorting them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and not to

be entangled with that bondage which was never meant as the portion of the sons of the free woman, and which if they willingly embraced they would lose their right to consider themselves as children of the free, and be in danger of being cast out with the children of the bondwoman. It is a remarkable fact that these words, on which St. Paul relies as a prediction that the Jewish covenant would be entirely cast away to make room for the Christian covenant, are not, strictly speaking, the words of Scripture at all—that is to say, they do not appear in Genesis as a prediction, but simply as the request made by Sarah to Abraham when she saw Ishmael mocking. For she said, "Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." It is true that God subsequently confirmed her words, commanding Abraham to hearken to her voice, "for in Isaac shall thy seed be called." But if the actual words are to be considered a prophecy—and St. Paul clearly takes them as such—it is because the whole history is prophetical when looked at, not as a mere record of past events, but as a setting forth in allegorical form of the mystery of God's dealings with His Church, in which all the actors do and say things of the deep spiritual meaning of which they are themselves altogether unaware, and the meaning of which may remain hidden for centuries after the actions have been performed and the words uttered.

An old name for this Sunday, as you know, is Refreshment Sunday; a sort of half-way house of rest in the austerities of Lent. And, perhaps, this passage was chosen as the Epistle for this Sunday because of the reminder which it brings to us—that we must not suffer our observance of times or seasons, or of fasts or mortifications to become a lifeless round of ceremonies, such as so much of the Mosaic ritual had become when St. Paul wrote to the Galatians. We are not children of the bondwoman but of the free; the motive of all our religious exercises must be, not a servile fear, but a loving devotion. The Galatians were being tempted to throw away the liberty with which Christ had made them free, and to seek for safety in the performance of those many rites and ceremonies which Moses had enjoined, which by the very manner in which they were performed, and the grievous yoke which they were felt to be even by the most righteous Jews, witnessed that they were not the portion of the children of the free woman but of the bondwoman. And yet the children of the free woman also must submit to rules and to the exercise of Godly discipline. As St. Paul points out at the beginning of this same chapter, "The heir as long as he is a child differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all, but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father." So we, as long as we are in the world, have need of rules and of obedience, even where we do not always see the exact object of the exercise commanded us. But the obedience of free children, if they are properly instructed and have a loving father whom they trust, is very different from the obedience of slaves. They know that the things commanded them, and the rules laid down for them either by their father himself, or by those to whose care he has committed them, are not imposed upon them with the object of gaining anything for their father but for their own good. And the obedience they render will be the obedience of loving trustfulness, which does not question or rebel, because it does not see the exact good to be gained, but believes that in the faithful discharge of what has been appointed they will be doing what is best for their own happiness hereafter, as well as pleasing the father whom they love.

It is this spirit of loving and trustful obedience which should be the motive of all our religious exercises. For it this alone which can give them life, and prevent our service degenerating into a mere drudgery. We have not a hard taskmaster, but a loving Father to please. Shall we be less ready to render Him obedience of this account? Surely the very reverse of this should be the case with us. Instead of being less careful, we shall be more careful not to offend One who loves us so, and watches over us with such tender care. A slave only renders obedience from fear of punishment; and if he thinks that he will not be found out, he will gladly avoid the performance of a distasteful duty. But the free obedience of a son will be something more than this; he loves to carry out his father's will, not from any hope of reward, or for the sake of avoiding punishment, but because he believes in and reverences his father's judgment. And so, whether the thing done is likely to meet his father's eye or not, he will do it for his father's sake, and feel a pleasure in the doing of it.

Lent is set apart as a time when we may mortify our carnal lusts and appetites, and give ourselves more diligently to meditation and prayer. It is possible that to some these things seem a weariness, and they are tempted to ask, Wherein are we better than the Jews of old if we are bound by such rules as these? and where is the freedom which is promised to us in the Gospel if we must submit to such a discipline as this? To others the temptation may be of a contrary nature; they look upon their Lenten exercises as an end rather than as a means, and their strict observance of them tends rather to spiritual pride than to edification. To both alike these words of the Epistle come opportunely on this Mid-Lent Sunday, "Brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." To the first because they are reminded that their religious exercises are not exacted from them by an unfeeling taskmaster, but are the things which a loving Father in His wisdom sees to be best for them, and that if they seem a weariness, the fault is rather in the spirit in which

they are set about than in the things themselves; to the second, because they are shown that it is not the number of the things done, or the tasks performed—which is of so much importance—as the spirit in which they are done; and that however hard a slave may work, he can never raise himself to the rank of son; and that, therefore, the fact of our being called God's children is for no merit of our own but solely of God's infinite goodness and mercy; and the utmost we can do in return is but a small expression of the gratitude we owe to Him for thus calling us His free children in Christ Jesus, and can in no way earn a reward or credit for ourselves, since the utmost we can do is far too small a return for what has been already done for us; and if we step down from the freedom of sons, wherewith God has made us free, and seek the reward of servants for the tasks we do, we have no right to call ourselves anything but unprofitable servants, since we shall only have done that which we were commanded to do, even if we can say as much as that, for few indeed are those who can say that they have done those things which were commanded them. God has called us to freedom; do not let us seek again to be in bondage; but, on the other hand, do not let us imagine that freedom means the absence of all restraints; without restraints freedom would be impossible; and the freest people are those who are governed by the strictest laws. And if we would be truly free, our freedom must be sought, not in following our own desires, but in a loving surrender of our will to God, and in seeking in everything the honour of our Heavenly Father. And so shall we learn the full meaning of these words to which we have listened this morning, "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to Mr. C. B. HARNESS, *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled "Harness' Guide to Health," which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of Harness' Electropathic Belt and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper. MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives Advice Free of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1890.

"TRUTH" OR FALSEHOOD.

THE starting-point of those oft refuted plausibilities wherewith the Liberation Society tries to gain ground among the ignorant and the credulous is the hackneyed phrase: "The Church of England was founded by Henry VIII.," his doing so being accounted for by his intention to practically oust the Pope, in order to possess himself of the revenues of the Church, which he monopolised for his own personal use, or by presenting to the vacant preferments. Thus, we are told, if the Pope was the first tyrant claiming both spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, King Hal was the second, not differing in kind but in degree, both being monopolists, one of universal, the other of British sovereignty. A long declamation usually follows on the evil of monopolies in general, and religious monopolies in particular, pointing the moral upon the "State-paid Establishment." Certainly we have always been led to suppose that the bluff monarch was very fond of selfish indulgence, and a species of despotism more adapted to the 16th than the 19th century, and so far we might go, though no farther, with Mr. Fisher and the Society he represents. But whether they find that the arguments deduced from these premisses fail to convince their followers, or are in need of further backing, we cannot say, though it appears to be for one, if not both of these reasons, that Mr. Labouchere has seen fit to represent King Henry VIII. in a new light, and one more likely, as he might suppose, to irradiate the recesses of the popular mind. A few days ago he boldly asserted in *Truth* that Henry's object in giving the revenues

previously appropriated by the Romish Church to the "new" Church of England was to gratify the majority of the people! One cannot but smile at this change of front. The king who has always been held up as a rigid autocrat is suddenly trotted out as a democratic ruler with an eye to the people's benefit rather than his own aggrandisement. A novel and by no means bright idea this! It is not very likely that those who have been so sedulously taught to regard the Church of England as the outcome of the avarice of a defunct sovereign will be at once prepared to raise a triumphal arch to his memory, and hail him as the friend of the people, and of religious equality. Let us, however, assume that in bestowing the ecclesiastical revenues upon the Church of England he acted in full accord with the feelings and wishes of the majority. Then it follows that the majority were in favour of their being still devoted to religious uses—not to the religious uses of each and all sects, of which there were plenty in those days—but to the work of that particular body which Henry himself only claimed to reform, though his present day exponents persist that he founded it. Clearly this is a very different proceeding to what Mr. Labouchere advocates when he says that Church property should be utilised for secular education. Only in times of war and revolution has it been thus alienated to secular uses. For *all* Christian sects to have a share of the spoil would be contrary to the precedent of history, since Henry gave it to those who most nearly resembled the Church which had forfeited it, claiming that, being purged of abuses, it was made like to the primitive model, and those who would not conform to its sacraments and ordinances had no claim to the temporalities of which he was the *ex officio* guardian. It is a favourite assertion of the Liberationists that our endowments are in great part the rightful property of the Church of Rome. Were this so, then as a considerable portion is derived from pious benefactions made prior to the Romish supremacy, it goes to prove that Rome must have despoiled a pre-existing Church. When pointing this out to a red-hot radical preacher we were once informed that there was no Christianity in England before the days of Augustine. "What then of Alban the martyr?" we humbly enquired. "Oh, ah. No, you see. Before Augustine there could be nothing of the kind; for they had the Druids and the Romans in Britain then!" Well, it is at least consoling to be to told that, if there have been two, if not three churches, founded in England since the introduction of Christianity, the last and still existing one was founded in deference to the wishes of the majority of the people, who preferred that the spoils of an apostate church should be bestowed—not on secular education, nor on all sects alike, but on the endowment of a Church having sacraments and ministry based upon those instituted by the apostles.

ST. MICHAEL'S, COVENTRY: PAST PRESENT, AND FUTURE.

A Sketch by the Rev. John NAPLETON, Rector of Wymington, Beds., sometime Incumbent of Christ Church, Coventry.

The history of such a renowned ecclesiastical institution as that centring on the grand edifice which was reopened on April 22nd, is far too lengthy for the present paper, even if the writer were qualified to develop it in an adequate manner. But the completion of what may be described as being no less a national than a local work, the preservation of one of the national monuments of antiquity, calls for a brief outline at least, which will be interesting to the readers of a Church newspaper. In these times, when Local Government, redistribution of Parliamentary seats, and county boundaries occupy so much of the public attention, a large share of thought is running parallel with them on the subject of the ecclesiastical rearrangement of our dioceses and parishes, the building and restoration of churches following closely upon it. A striking instance of this is to be met with in the ancient and populous City of Coventry. At the beginning of this century it gave one of the titles to the then existing diocese of Lichfield and Coventry; in 1812 it was attached to what has become the overgrown Diocese of Worcester; while it is now upon the eve of being transferred to a new See, entitled "Birmingham and Coventry." We believe that in living memory a sum not far short of £100,000 has been raised locally for Church building and restoration, commencing in 1829 with the reclamation of a portion of the site of the Franciscan Church in Cheylesmore. Between that year and 1832 a large new church was erected, having at its north-east the ancient "Greyfriars Steeple," and was by desire of the Bishop named Christ Church, but without a parish attached, being constituted a Chapel of Ease to St. Michael's, with its own incumbent. The next in order was St. Peter's, with a district taken out of Holy Trinity parish, St. Thomas', St. Mark's, and All Saints' following as District Churches in due course. Various restorations and repairs were from time to time effected at the three ancient Churches of St. Michael, Holy Trinity, and St. John. But a wider and complete restoration of St. Michael's was becoming imperative, when in 1884 the fund was started by a munificent donation of £10,000 from Mr. George Woodcock, a leading citizen and partner in one of those enormous cycle works which have pulled Coventry together after the depression in the watch and ribbon trades. Under the direction of Mr. Oldrid Scott, Messrs. Thompson, of Peterborough, set to work, and a scaffolding of extreme intricacy soon hid the tower and spire from view, mounting up some 300 feet to the vane at the summit. Heavy and ponderous as some of these beams really were, they looked light and threadlike at so great a height. From a photograph (taken, we believe, by Mr. Wingrave) a very good engraving of this curious erection was presented to the readers of the *Coventry Times* last week, with parallel to it, another engraving of the spire in its completed state. St. Michael's was not intended for a Cathedral, as near to it was the older foundation of St. Mary, of which nothing remains but a few stones hard by, though it must originally have been a very large and imposing structure. But no existing edifice could be more fitted to be the

Mother Church of the proposed new diocese. Birmingham is essentially modern, and has nothing that can "hold a candle to it." Therefore it would be an egregious blunder were it not now raised to its proper dignity, especially as it stands in the heart of a large population, that of its own parish alone having increased from 11,000 in 1831, to 23,000 in 1881. It is a national monument, of which England may be justly proud, and the restoration committee determined to appeal to the nation with the result witnessed on the 22nd when the old west door opened for the first time, and a procession of nearly 200 clergy entered with the venerable Bishop of Worcester, conducting to his seat in the *sacrarium* the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was then that the capacity of the church was tested, and more than 4,000 persons gained admittance without any crushing or unseemliness. But this is not the first building erected for sacred uses on this spot. History speaks first of Ranulf, Earl of Chester, founding a chapel dedicated to St. Michael for the monks of Coventry in 1133. This was a Norman building occupying much less space. As the art of building progressed, the monks, in the time of Richard II., wished to erect a more imposing fabric. Part of the materials of the first were incorporated with the second church, of which all that now remains is the south wall, from the screen to St. Thomas' Chapel, the south porch, the west door, and parts of the west and north walls. This church was adorned by the present tower, due to two brothers named Bota or Botoner, who gave £100 a year for 21 years till it was finished in 1394. The gift was a much larger one in those days than it would be now when we compare the relative value of money. Mary and Ann Botoner, relatives of the above citizens, furnished means to build the spire, and probably the choir also. "Ann and Mary built the Quire," as a a quaint old rhyme has it. The present nave was then in course of construction, the lateral chapels being added afterwards. In the year 1429 the bells were first hung in the steeple, consisting of a peal of five, with a "Jesus Belle" added some 60 years later. "The Bells of St. Michael's Tower" as now existing, though silent in consequence of its being pronounced unsafe to replace them in the tower, were erected by Pack and Chapman of Whitechapel in 1774, the tenor weighing 32 cwt. 9lbs. On the 4th bell is this inscription :

> "While thus we join in cheerful sound
> May love and loyalty abound."

On the 7th bell is the following—

> "Ye singers all that prize your health and happiness
> Be sober, merry, wise, and you'll the same possess."

On the old No. 7 bell (date 1674) we find :

> "I ring to sermon with a lusty bome,
> That all may come and none may stay at home."

It has been a source of great grief to the inhabitants that it appears impacticable to re-erect the bells. A campanile has been designed, and, like the Botoners of old, and a namesake of his own in a former generation, Mr. Woodcock has again come forward with a promise of £5,000, half the sum required, if the rest can be raised. The organ is practically a new one, some of the old materials having been amalgamated with a large new instrument by Willis, in which those of us who remember the old organ miss that sweet and mellow tone which has been sacrificed to brilliancy and power. Accounts for an organist appear as early as 1505 to "John Gylbard, organist of St. Michael's." The last organ was erected in 1733 by Thomas Swarbrick, a German, at a cost of about £1,400. It contained at one time stops called harp, lute, and dulcimer. It was reopened by Matthew Payne in 1818, the choruses being sung by the Coventry Cecilian Society. In 1836 the organ having been rebuilt by Bishop, there was another musical performance, in which the Coventry Choral Society took part, the conductor being the now nonagenarian organist, Mr. Simms, whose playing was highly commended in the local papers of that date. This veteran was present at the reopening services the other day. He has resigned for some time, full of years and honours, his post being filled by Mr. H. A. Brewer, a talented pupil and former assistant of Mr. Charles Harford Lloyd at Gloucester Cathedral, whose manipulation of the gigantic instrument, which now stands in one of the chapels, is very masterly and effective. There are also a clock and chimes made by William Worton, of Birmingham, in 1779, playing a different piece every three hours. The pew system happily exists no longer. "Rich and poor now occupy the same level. No sleeping rooms for the one class, with the bare stones of the aisles for the other, but equality in the house of God." The stained glass windows, especially at the east end, are very beautiful, and there is something peculiarly attractive in the two outer windows of the apses, which rivet the eye with their "kaleidoscope pattern," being filled with fragments of old glass collected from various parts of the church when the lower windows were reglazed.

A word now as to the monastic orders of Coventry, more especially connected with St. Michael's. In the time of King Stephen we read that Ranulf, Earl of Chester, gave the lands to the Monks, "being satisfied that it was theirs by right." The Carthusians had a priory or "Chartreuse" (now called the "Charter House") about half a mile out of the town. It still contains some interesting relics, notably an old staircase in a wall, worn by the knees of penitents, and some old tapestry work, recently brought to light and carefully preserved by the proprietor, Mr. W. F. Wyley. The Monk's Refectory is still in use. Outside the site of a church is traceable, and the boundary wall, a very massive one, continues to present a barrier against intruders. There is an underground passage, now closed, which originally led from the monastery to St. Michael's Church. There were Black and White Friars, and of the "Friar of Orders Grey," it is related, that "Ranulf Blunderville, sixth Earl of Chester, who lived at Cheylesmore Castle, Coventry, gave an adjoining field to the Friars Minors, on which they built their monastery and church. In 1538 King Henry VIII. dissolved this monastery, and the church and other buildings were sold in 1542." A capital picture of St. Michael's, showing the aisles and chapels on the north side, is presented with the last issue of the *Coventry Standard.* The best works on the history of this, and the other objects of interest in the city, are by Dugdale ; Thomas Sharpe, the antiquary ; the late Messrs. Reader, father and son; W. G. Fretton, F.S.A. ; and a collection, extending over many years, of cuttings from books and newspapers, made by Mr. Edwin Mander, ex-Warden of St. Michael's and Christ Church. All these may be seen at the Free Reference Library. I will conclude with words addressed to my congregation at Christ Church on the celebration of its jubilee in 1881 : "Dearly do we love

the Mother Church, I believe I may say brethren, in in *your* name, and for myself, the name of St. Michael's, Coventry, will ever be found written on my heart."

Reviews and Notices.

"THE TREASURY." London: Nisbet and Co.

As usual the April *Treasury* is replete with valuable matter. We should especially draw attention to the leading thoughts for sermons. One by Mr. Blackburn seems wonderfully full of fresh conception, and we should advise all our readers to secure this valuable periodical. This month's copy contains also a good paper by Mr. J. A. Anderson. We always look forward to the arrival of the *Treasury*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—I fear "Inquirens" has not quite apprehended how much he needs to prove. When he says that the four instances mentioned in Canon Liddon's sermon are "facts, historical facts, related in the Old Testament," he unconsciously begs the question. The very thing that we desire to know is whether they are historical facts. In the Old Testament there are many narratives which contain contradictory elements; many which seem coloured by the narrator; some, at least, which bear a strong appearance of having been selected from current traditions to become the vehicles of inspired religious teaching without being in any strict sense historical. Are we to accept all such narratives in block as historically true in all their details because our Lord occasionally referred to a small incident here and there in them as illustrating His religious teaching?

For instance, the compiler of Genesis tells us, in the second story of the Creation, that God took a rib from out Adam's side and made it into a woman; and on this he founds the law of marriage which lies at the root of family life. That law is quoted by our Lord, and stamped by Him with His supreme authority. Are we, therefore, bound to believe that the story of the rib is absolute historical fact? Again, our Lord, foreshowing in a parable the doom of the Jewish nations, uses the current notion that demons haunt waterless places—a conception very similar to the more modern superstition that ghosts haunt churchyards or tragic spots; are we, therefore, bound to believe, as of faith, that it is really the habit of ejected demons to prowl restlessly about dry places? If "Inquirens" answers in the negative, he surrenders his position; if in the affirmative, I can only say that his faith must be so greatly in advance of his critical faculty as to render all discussion of the subject useless.

I would add two remarks. One is that for dealing with these questions it is not only some theological knowledge that is necessary, but also some of that literary culture and discernment which are only to be obtained by studying the modes in which different nations and different ages embody their ideas. To take the literary canons of this modern European world, and judge by them the literature of the East, hoary with the lapse of three or four thousand years, can do nothing but produce a crop of blunders, which would be superlatively ludicrous were not their consequences in many cases so lamentable.

My other remark is that about all these matters there really is no authoritative deliverance of our Lord's. An allusion to a well-known narrative, for the purpose of pointing a religious lesson, is very different from an assertion that the narrative is strictly historical. Anyone may, indeed, prefer to consider it the same, but that would be merely his private opinion; another person may take the opposite view without being in the smallest degree less orthodox or less justified by reason. Even when our Lord quotes a psalm as David's, in accordance with the Jewish belief, there really is no reason, logical or theological, for concluding that David personally wrote it, so long as it is plain that it was not our Lord's purpose to teach the authorship of the psalm, but only to foil the Pharisees by an appeal to its phraseology. On the other hand, the danger of making purely artificial deductions about these things from our Lord's allusive treatment of them must stare any thinking man in the face, and warn him not wantonly to throw stumbling-blocks in the way of persons who wish to believe in Christ, and yet cannot do so in defiance of their reason.

PRESBYTER.

SIR,—I think this controversy may be narrowed on these clear limits:—

(1.) What do "Presbyter" and his backers-up believe? A.—That all about Lot's wife, Jonah, the Deluge, etc., are all parables, like that of Dives and Lazarus. (2.) What was the Jewish tradition at our Lord's time? A.—This, I suppose, can be learnt with certainty from the Jewish commentators. (3.) What did our Lord teach and believe? A.—What He taught is plain. His Resurrection was to be as real as Jonah's. That the Jews so understood Him is plain from their words to Pilate, "That deceiver said," etc. When our Lord spoke of Jonah's history, and that of Lot's wife, if the Pharisees and lawyers regarded these things as mere parables, would they not have said so? Did they not lie in wait to catch Him up in any slip? (4.) If our Lord, being mistaken, taught and believed in them as histories, to what limits does not His authority dwindle?

I think we have here the whole matter in a few words.

C.C., V.-G.

"THE FULNESS OF TIME."

SIR,—Among the many lessons from the Cross may the subjoined hold a place?

Our Lord came in the fulness of Time, and by this I understand the period entered upon by the coming of Christ, Heb. i. 2, the beginning of the end, when time shall be no more, and at this beginning Grecian literature and fine arts had reached their greatest height. The Greek language with all its polish had been stamped upon the greater part of the known world through the conquests of Alexander; and though about the time of the coming of our Saviour Greece had yielded to the power of Rome, it had not done so sufficiently long to compel the Grecian to

yield to the Latin tongue, and no one was considered to have finished his education, or to be accomplished who had not been trained in the schools of Athens or Corinth, or even Alexandria. If this be the case, do we not see the wonderful provision of Providence in arranging the time when the record of our Lord's life and the Gospel teaching should be written in Greek? And that the Septuagint should be the means of bringing to the knowledge of the heathen world the history of the Jews or Hebrews, and also the Mosaic laws which influenced so much the laws of Rome, and the (at that time) modern philosophy, as shown in the writings of Marcus Aurelius, Seneca, and others; and our Lord having so often quoted from it gave thereby His sanction to the work.

The Hebrews would be naturally tenacious of their language, and would no doubt not willingly learn more than was absolutely necessary of the conquering languages. Thus, at the time of the crucifixion, the three languages would be known at Jerusalem, and be a reason for Pontius Pilate writing "The Superscription" of our Lord's title in them. Was not this really a very mysterious, and, in a sense, miraculous act? and was not this nailing a death blow to all three languages?

I imagine a language can only be considered living as long as it can be used for trade or intercourse; all three are dead. Is a Jew an inhabitant of any country, the language of that country is his language, for Hebrew is of no use to him, if any, beyond the use of the services of his synagogue.

The word of God is unalterable being now expressed in unchanging and unchangeable languages, and in this fixity may we not see the unchangeable love of Christ? And this leads me on to see in the crucifixion of the two thieves with our Lord a fulfilment of His own prophecy typically set forth, that He being lifted up would draw all men unto Him (see also ciii. Psalm). The one thief representing the Gentile world and the other the Hebrew. The repentant thief, the Hebrew, who had been the keeper of the oracles of God, and knew the will of God, to him repentance was necessary, and when he witnessed and realised the greatness of his sins, in seeing the Just One dying for him, uttered that earnest prayer, "Lord, remember me when Thou comest to Thy kingdom." The other thief, the unrepentant Gentile, who had not known of the law of God, had, so to speak, nothing to repent of. The handwriting thus, in mercy, speaks to us of sins forgiven; it was like the handwriting upon the wall declaring to Satan, his kingdom had departed from him, the slaves were now released, and transferred to the kingdom not of this world. The Lord Jesus was the triumphant conqueror, and all things were made subject unto Him.

Or to take a yet wider or more particular view, may we not see in this picture on Calvary, Christ the head —the crown of perfection and rejoicing; the Body, the Church, saved in and by Him, and in the various members of this Body, the different churches who have held on to Christ without cutting themselves off from Him, though erring against the Catholic faith in some point.

On the one side, the schismatics, the dividers of the body, retaining some measure of the truth in Jesus, even to heretics, so esteemed and called by fellow-men, in whom may be found more truth, than given credit for, and who make their peace with God in the person of the repentant thief.

While on the other side is represented in the unrepentant thief, the heathen who having been only a law unto themselves, know not of Christ, yet need the forgiveness of their ignorances and offences.

C. J. W.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allbrook, Rev. H. O., Licensed to preach in the Diocese of London.
Black, Rev. C. I., D.D., Vicar of Burley-in-Wharfedale; Rural Dean of Otley.
Caley, Rev. William Bertram Russell, M.A., Vicar of Watton, Norfolk.
Cosens, Rev. William Reyner, D.D., Vicar of Dudley; Vicar of St. Luke's, West Norwood.
Dixon, Rev. William Francis, B.A., Rector of Ashby and Obey-with-Thirne, Norfolk.
Earle, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Rector of Fovant, Wilts.
Evans, Rev. Arthur C., M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Colossus*.
Fisher, Rev. J., Vicar of St. Stephen's-by-Launceston.
Floyd, Rev. J., Vicar of All Souls', South Hampstead.
Gilbard, Rev. E. F., M.A., Head Master of Norwich Grammar school.
Hanning, Rev. C. H., M.A., London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Hodges, Rev. Herbert Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Long Lane, Derbyshire.
Ives, Rev. George Shepheard, B.A., Vicar of Tunstead-with-Sco Ruston, Norfolk.
Macdonald, Rev. Thomas Mosse, M.A., Rector of St. Paul's, Kersal; Rural Dean of Salford.
Mapleton, Rev. David, M.A., Licensed General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.
Moberly, Rev. R. C., M.A., Vicar of Great Budworth; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.
Morgan, Rev. Alfred, Vicar of Denham, Suffolk.
Murphy, Rev. Richard Hovenden, M.A., Rector of Bridford, Devonshire.
Newell, Rev. C. Frederick, M.A., Rector of Chiselborough and Rural Dean; Prebendary of Wells Cathedral.
Norman. Rev. E. F., Vicar of Watford, Rugby.
Norris, Rev. Edward John, M.A., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Earley, Berks.
Palmer, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Chilthorne Domer, Somerset-shire.
Pattinson, Rev. Joseph A., M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Salford; Vicar of St. George's, Chorley.
Peile, Rev. W. O., M.A., Vicar of Selborne.
Penney, Rev. R. G., M.A., Rector of Warbleton, Sussex; Vicar of Dudley.
Pitts, Rev. T., M.A., Rector of Loughborough and Rural Dean; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Leicestershire.
Redpath, Rev. Henry Adeney, M.A., Vicar of Sparsholt-with-Kingston-Lisle, Berks.
Roberts, Rev. Alexander, M.A., Rector of Kimberley; Vicar of St. Peter's, Hereford.
Roney-Douglas, Rev. J. C., B.A., Vicar of Castle Donington, Derby.
Spencer, Rev. R. E., Vicar of St. John's, Maidstone.
Stowell, Canon Thomas Alfred, M.A., Rector of St. Lawrence, Chorley; Rural Dean of Leyland.
Warre, Canon, M.A., Vicar of Melksham; Rector of Fuggle-stone and Bemerton, Salisbury.
Watkins, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Gamlingay; Rector of Willingham, Cambridge.
Wells, Rev. Herbert Methuen, B.A., Rector of Gunthorpe-with-Bale, Norfolk.
Woosnam, Rev. Charles Maxwell, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Lysaght, Rev. William Pulleine, Rector of the parish, at Sher-field-on-Loddon Rectory, on the 23rd ult., aged 53.
Pierpoint, Rev. R. W., for upwards of thirty years Incumbent of Holy Trinity Church, Eastbourne, at 40 Kenilworth-road, St. Leonard's-on-sea, on the 22nd ult., aged 78.
Tarbutt, Rev. Arthur Charles, for twenty-four years Vicar of St. Peter's, Streatham, at the Vicarage, Leigham-court-road, Streatham, on the 22nd ult., aged 81.

The Church of England Pulpit.

RESURRECTION THE PROOF OF DIVINITY.

By the Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.,

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, Sunday, April 6th, 1890.

"Who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."—Romans i. 3, 4.

A GREAT festival of the Christian church like Easter appears to have one drawback attending it from which days of less importance are comparatively free. It offers us so much to think about that, unless we try to make some one of the lessons which it teaches our own, it may pass by without leaving us the wiser or the better for taking part in it. The rays of truth which flash forth from a fact like the resurrection of our Lord are so many and so bright that if we do not fix our minds upon some one of them, and do what we can to understand its importance, we may only be dazzled into bewilderment by the splendid whole, and may carry away with us nothing that will afterwards shape our thoughts or influence our lives. And here St. Paul comes to our assistance by suggesting at the beginning of his greatest epistle a point which may well engage our attention, namely, the bearing of the resurrection on the divinity of our Lord. Among other things, the resurrection, he tells us, did this: it threw a special light on the higher nature of Jesus Christ, who was declared to be "the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead."

Now let us note for a moment that in the passage before us St. Paul summarily describes the contents of the Gospel, and says that it was wholly concerned with our Lord Jesus Christ and with two facts about Him more especially. The first fact that *He was really man with a human body and a human soul;* this was due to His being a member of a particular and well-known Jewish family. "According to the flesh," that is, in respect of His human nature, He was "born of the seed of David." The second fact was that although man He was more than man, "according to the spirit of holiness," that is, in respect of His higher and superhuman nature, *He was declared to be the Son of God.* The phrase, "According to the spirit of holiness," in the second clause, corresponds to and contrasts with the phrase "according to the flesh" in the first clause; and as the flesh in this passage certainly means human nature and not, as often, the corrupt or animalized principle in human nature, so "the spirit of holiness" means not the third person in the Godhead who sanctifies us, but the higher or divine nature of Christ somewhat vaguely described and set over against His human nature. For this less common use of the word "spirit" we have a warrant in two other passages of the New Testament at least, and the resulting sense is that as our Lord was seen to be truly human by the fact of His birth in the family of David, so the true import and character of His higher nature became apparent when He rose from the dead.

Here, then, is open to us a subject of the highest interest on this greatest of Christian festivals, when the Church throughout the world stands around the empty sepulchre, proclaiming that Christ is risen from the dead. For here we are taught by the apostle to think of that resurrection not only as a reversal of the humiliation and defeat which had preceded it, not only as the certificate of the mission of the greatest Teacher of religion to mankind, but as something more, as a declaration, or more precisely, a definition of what in respect of His superhuman nature our Lord really was and is. The resurrection was not only a wonder, it was an instruction, it was the means of making it plain to all who had spiritual eyes to see that He who rose was much more than the first of prophets and apostles, that He was no less than the only begotten Son of God, who had shared God's throne and His nature from all eternity.

That which the apostle's words may first of all suggest to us is *the importance of events.* He attributes, you observe, to a single event the power of setting forth a great truth, just as though the event were a speaker or a book. Christ, he says, was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead. Undoubtedly, brethren, events are for God what language is for man. They are the manner, the means whereby God reveals His mind and will. Events are the language of God written on the pages of human history, whether it be the history of a man or of a family or of a nation or of the world. Just as God's eternal power and Godhead are, according to the apostle, clearly understood by reverent study of the book of Nature—the "things that are made" as he calls it—so the judgments which are formed in the Divine mind on men, on families, on nations, are discoverable in the book of human history, as they are written in the language of events. This, of course, must appear an unreasonable statement to those who imagine that all that happens to mankind—birth and death, sickness and health, good and bad seasons, national prosperity and national decline—are the results of blind forces which exist, *why* we know not, *wherefore* we know not, but which have, it seems, somehow given us existence only that, like the seaweed that is tossed this way or that on the surf of the waves, we may illustrate their relentless power and our own abject helplessness. But it will not appear unreasonable to any

man who sincerely believes in a living God, in a God whose rules of working are not His masters, nor yet powers which, after owing to Him their being, have somehow escaped from His control; but only the free manifestations by Himself of that order which is the rule of His life. He Himself is everywhere present, everywhere and incessantly intelligent and at work, so that by Him the hairs of our head are all numbered, and without Him not a sparrow falls to the ground. To believe in a living God is to believe that events which He brings about or permits are a declaration of His mind. But then whether the characters in which His mind is thus declared are always legible by man or by all men is quite another question. Sometimes indeed they are written in a familiar alphabet; their meaning is so clear that all men may read it. All who believed that the world is governed by a moral god understood what was meant by the fall of Babylon, by the capture of Rome by Alaric, by the close of the career of Napoleon. Sometimes they are written in characters as wholly unintelligible to all living men as were the Egyptian hieroglyphics half a century ago, though they may be read by the higher intelligences around the throne in heaven, or they may be read hereafter on earth, for all that we know, by highly endowed souls. And in the book of history there is much written of this kind which eludes the efforts of man's inquisitive and constant gaze. But sometimes also the meaning of God's writing in events is hidden from the mass of men at first sight, but becomes plain to them when the key of its interpretation has been given them by some competent instructor, like the "Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin," traced on the wall of the banqueting chamber of the Eastern monarch, the sense of which was plain when a Daniel had been summoned to decipher it. Of such handwriting as this, too, history is full, but we must not linger on it, since we have to fix our attention on one great example of it in one particular event, the resurrection of our Lord.

Now that a striking occurrence such as the resurrection would have a special meaning or several meanings is an obvious supposition. The strange thing would be if such an event could occur without any purpose or meaning at all; and St. Paul tells us what, in his inspired judgment, one such meaning was; it was to declare that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. Endeavour, my brethren, to think what sort of impression would be created in your minds, if, after following to the grave one whom you had dearly loved for many years, after listening to the last office of the Church and watching the sod as it was thrown in upon the coffin, you should see that same friend or relative enter your room with the old look, the well-known figure and expression, the accustomed voice, remaining just long enough to assure you that he was here again, and then passing swiftly away to comfort and encourage some other mourner. And yet this is, in substance, what did happen to Mary Magdalene, to the holy women, to Peter, to Thomas, to the two disciples, to the ten on the day of our Lord's resurrection from the dead. Such an event could not but have a great significance. Even if the risen one should not utter a word, the mere appearance of such a visitor would be pregnant with meaning. It would declare a great deal that at first we should find it hard to put into words about the unseen world and this, about life and death, about the ways of God, and about the destiny of man.

You will allow this and much more. But why, you may ask, should our Lord's resurrection have the higher and particular effect of declaring Him to be the Son of God. Others, you may well urge, had visited the realms of death, and had returned to life, who were not declared by this awful experience to be divine. We need not travel beyond the records of the gospel history in order to meet with the widow's son at Nain, and with Lazarus at Bethany. Certainly in these cases resurrection to life was a signal token of the Divine favour; it left them as it found them, members of the human family still subject to the law of death. What was it in our Lord's case which invested His resurrection with this declaratory force which the apostle ascribes to it? The answer is, first of all, that the resurrection of our Lord was a verification of the proof which He had voluntarily offered of His own claim. The Jewish doctors had understood the words of the psalm as addressed to Messiah, "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee," not only of His birth before time as it is understood in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but also of His rising from the dead, and in this sense it is employed by St. Paul in that wonderful appeal to the Jewish conscience which he made in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, Scripture thus bearing its own witness to the depth below depth of meaning which lies in its very simplest words. Therefore our Lord, knowing what was involved in the claim to be Messiah, foretold His resurrection certainly on six, probably on more, occasions; and it was in this fulfilment of His own prediction—a prediction based on the deeper sense of the ancient Scriptures—that St. Paul recognises a declaration of the Divine Sonship of Christ. The resurrection was an intervention of the Almighty Father on behalf of His well-beloved Son; it was an assertion by a Son of His real relationship to the Father; it was a proof that the uncertainties of the future and the laws of the physical world were alike subject to His supreme control; it was an event in the manner of its accomplishment so altogether exceptional and striking that the Apostle's appeal to it as declaratory of our Lord's divinity is, if the expression might be allowed, only natural. Our Lord Himself had summoned the widow's son to rise from the bier; He had summoned Lazarus to issue from the recesses of the tomb, but no form of majesty or power stood by His grave, no voice of authority was heard to speak when before the dawn His human

soul, returning from the regions of the dead, reunited itself with the holy body that lay in the sepulchre to pass forth into the world of living men. It was a declaration that He who had died and was buried was the Son of God.

But further, in our Lord's case the resurrection did not stand alone. It is abstractedly conceivable that the foolish or bad might be raised from the dead with superhuman power; one day, we Christians know, they will be, in order to give account of the things done in the body. In our Lord's case resurrection from the dead was combined with absolute holiness and wisdom, with words such as never man spake, with a life that none who had witnessed it could convict of sin, in short, with a manifestation of truth and goodness which had never before been offered to the human conscience. The resurrection was the fitting complement to the life and teaching of our Lord; it confirmed the anticipations which that life and teaching naturally raised; it was the countersign in the sphere of physical being of a judgment which had already been formed in the sphere of instructed conscience. Had our Lord lived and taught and then rotted in His grave even His life would have died away in time from the memories of men. Had He risen—it is an impossible supposition—without having lived His life, His resurrection would have been merely a blank wonder, appealing only to imagination, and saying nothing to the sense of right and truth. As it is, it proclaimed to all the world what disciples like Peter at Cæsarea Philippi had owned before at their Master's feet; it proclaimed that He who was crucified, dead, and buried, is the Son of God, declared to be such by His resurrection from the dead.

But the Apostle says that the declaration of the Divine Sonship of Christ which was made by the resurrection was made "with power." The resurrection did not hesitatingly suggest that our Lord might possibly be the Son of God; it amounted, when taken together with His life and character and teaching to a demonstration irresistible and overwhelming, at least to the Apostle himself, that He was the Son of God. I say to the Apostle himself, because, looking at the connection of the passage, it is scarcely open to doubt that the expression "with power" points first of all to a personal experience. Saul of Tarsus, at that time an active young rabbi in Jerusalem strongly attached to the cause of thePharisee party, was not one of the privileged company to whom our risen Redeemer showed Himself during the great forty days As an unconverted Jew he would have looked at the person and work of Jesus through an atmosphere discoloured by false reports and by implacable controversial passions. For Saul, the rabbi Jesus was only a teacher who had established for Himself in the mind of the educated many the character and authority of a prophet whose influence was steadily directed against that of the representatives of the established order of things in Jerusalem, and who had only met with His deserts when He was put to a cruel death by the Roman authority. The tragedy of Calvary, no doubt, he would have said at the time, would be a nine days' wonder, and other persons and events of interest would come to the front, and all would be forgotten. Nor would this have been disturbed by the rumours which may have reached Saul's ears that there had been one or more apparitions of Jesus after His death. Saul's robust scepticism would have whispered to itself that rumours of this kind were only to be expected among the credulous and disappointed followers whom Jesus had misled, and that they were not deserving of serious consideration; and so he would have gone his way, in his bitter sincerity even going so far as to place himself at the disposal of the persecuting party, not his own, which filled the highest places of the Jewish priesthood, and to take a foremost part in the cruelties by which it was hoped to stamp out the very name of the infant church. Then came the journey to Damascus and [that scene among the low hills of the desert some few miles from the city gate which was to change the foremost persecutor of Christ into the most devoted of His flock. And what was it that that scene brought home with irresistible power to the mind of Saul of Tarsus? Many truths, no doubt, but this, pre-eminently, that Jesus, of whom he had dreamed as stricken and silenced for ever in the stillness of the tomb, was alive and ruling men and events from the clouds of heaven. And how and since what date this had come to be the case Saul would have learnt from Ananias at Damascus, and still more so when he went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and James, and Thomas, and the penitent Magdalene, and the two disciples who walked to Emmaus, and as many as he would see in passing through Galilee, and those five hundred who had seen the risen Lord on one single occasion. On the great fact there was evidence enough and to spare, if only there was the mind open to receive it, and when the fact that Jesus who was crucified had thus risen from the dead was established in the mind of Paul as a certainty beyond all discussion, how inevitably would it have changed his whole way of looking at all else about Jesus! It was, then, Jesus, and not himself and his instructors, who held the truth according to those ancient Scriptures; it was the teaching of Jesus, and not that of the rabbinical schools, which followed on in the direct line of Moses and the prophets. Those miracles of Jesus of which he had heard were only what might be expected from the Messianic prophecies; and this crowning wonder of all which Jesus had predicted as designed to follow on His death lifted yet further and more completely the veil that hung before the eyes of the astonished and humble rabbi, and showed that He who could thus make the past and the present alike minister to His glory, He who could rule at once in the conscience

of men, and mould at pleasure the forces on high, He who could bend into utter submission the mind and the will of His stoutest adversary, must be indeed of more than human stature, must be indeed Divine. To St. Paul the resurrection was a revelation of the divinity of the Son of God made with power. It would be for St. Paul, and much more we may believe for those who saw the risen Redeemer once and again, conversed with Him, ate with Him, touched Him. Such certainly was the effect on the Apostle who was, it might seem, naturally of a sceptical turn of mind. Although, as our collect says, for the greater confirmation of the faith he was doubtful of Christ's resurrection, what was Thomas's exclamation when our Lord offered His hands and His side to the inquisitive touch of the Apostle? "My Lord and my God." Those five wounds in the risen body were a revelation not of Christ's manhood only, but of His deity. They proclaimed the veiled power that had conquered death. And so it has been ever since. The resurrection has been felt to be the fact which, beyond all others, proclaims Christ to man as the Son of God. When Judas had gone his way, the important requisite in his successor was that he was to be a witness to the resurrection. The resurrection was the burden of all the recorded preaching of the earliest church; the Gospel it preached was the Gospel of the resurrection, whether in the mouth of Peter or Stephen or St. Paul, it was all the same. And at this moment all who think seriously on the matter know that the resurrection is the point at which the creed which carries us to the faith of heaven is most clearly embedded in the soil of earth; most really capable of asserting a place for its divine and living subject in the history of our race. Disprove the resurrection, and Christianity fades away into thin air as a graceful, but discredited illusion. But as a certain fact, it does its work as at the first in every honest conscience and intellect. More than any other event, it proclaims Christ to be the Son of God with power in millions of Christian souls.

It is said, I know, that a wonder of this kind, however calculated to impress bygone generations, is not likely to weigh powerfully with our own, and on the ground that we, the men of to-day, are less struck by suspensions of natural law than by the unvarying order of things. Every age no doubt has its fashions in the world of thought and literature, no less than in the world of manners and dress; and if we survey a sufficient range of time, we shall see that these fashions in thought, or many of them, are not less liable to have their day, and to be discarded than the other fashions. Nor need a man be a prophet in order to predict that the fashion which professes to attach less importance to a proved fact which involves a suspension of natural law, whether by the intervention of a higher law or otherwise, than to the general course and regularity of nature, is a fashion that will not last. Of course, if a man says that no such suspension of natural law, no miracle, is possible, the question is a different and, in a sense, a more important one; but I am for the moment thinking of people who say that they deny neither the possibility nor the occurrence of miracle, and yet point with some sort of satisfaction to the fashionable temper of the time which does not think highly of the importance of miracle; and such a fashion I say will pass if only because it is out of harmony with the average common sense of human nature. When does a fellow-man attract our attention? Is it when he is acting as he is wont, or when he is acting in some manner which we did not anticipate, excelling himself, as we say, or falling below himself; a good man, as we thought him, falling into wickedness and being a partaker with adulterers; a bad man, as we thought him, rising to the heights of generosity and sacrifice; a wise man committing himself for the moment to some startling folly; a foolish man uttering some opinion the value of which commands the respect of the wise? And when the Ruler of the Universe suspends His wonted rules by such a miracle as the raising of the dead, the importance of His acts will not be disposed of by a passing mood of thought which, fresh from laboratories and observatories, thinks more of law than of the suspension of law. No, our Lord's rising declares to us, as it declared to our forefathers, the Divine Sonship of Jesus, and it will do this as it has done it hitherto, "with power." We know what death is. We have known, most of us, at some moment in our lives what we would have given to be able to break its chain, and in the light of this experience we may own the true majesty of Him "who liveth and was dead; and, behold He is alive for evermore, and has the keys of hell and death."

And, lastly, there is another sense in which the resurrection from the dead is a declaration with power that Jesus is the Son of God. No one can read the epistles of St. Paul without observing that he constantly speaks of the crucifixion and the resurrection not only as events in the life of Jesus upon earth, but as spiritual transactions which take place within the Christian soul or character. He bids Christians to "crucifiy the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof." He says of himself, "I am crucified with Christ"; and addressing his readers at Ephesus, he quotes a Christian hymn of the earliest age, "Awake, thou that sleepest, arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." He exclaims in his epistle to his Colossian friends, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above." It is true that this language of St. Paul is more particularly connected with the entrance of new converts into the Church of Christ by baptism. Conversion involved a crucifixion of the old corrupt nature, and then, as the new convert was dipped beneath the baptismal waters and raised again by the minister of the sacraments, he was, in

St. Paul's words, "Buried with Christ in baptism and raised again to newness of life." But although that is the first and more usual application of the Apostle's language, his language also applies to the circumstances of the altered life of baptised Christians who have fallen from God and from grace, and need to return to God by a fresh conversion. If the body of Christ could only rise once from the grave the Christian soul may certainly need to rise a second time; may, after a fall from grace, need such a resurrection unless all is to be lost. And when such an event in the moral or spiritual world takes place it is strange if they who look on do not learn from it something that they had not known before about the Son of God. Is it nothing that a soul should lie in the grave of sin, and then, touched by a mighty inspiring voice bidding it arise and live, should pass forth to a new life, redeemed and purified? So it has been sometimes in youth, sometimes in middle life, sometimes in declining years, almost within sight of death, with men of the most opposite characters, and the most various positions, whose experiences of sin have been as unlike as possible. So it was in one age with Augustine, at once a man of cultivation and a libertine, whom one verse of the Apostle St. Paul made a saint and teacher of the Church; so it was with the profligate Earl of Rochester in the days of the Restoration. So in our own time with the popular French atheist Taxil, who a few years ago devoted his whole time to propagating blasphemy against his Creator and Redeemer. So with Littré, the polished man of letters, from whose mental atmosphere, almost until the last hour had come, God was utterly shut out by a false philosophy. For each of these—the profligate young philosopher, the debauched courtier, the atheistic lecturer, the refined but godless man of letters—God had His purpose and His hour of mercy, and each accepted it. You may some of you have known men, the bearers of less famous names than these, or living in private life, who have been the subjects of the spiritual resurrection. We may see the dead souls joined to bodies of activity and vigour, joined to minds of intelligence and force, but not on that account the less dead. Such a soul lies in the grave of sin; it is blind, deaf, dumb, motionless, cold and putrid; it sees not the works of God in providence and life, His mercies, His judgments; it hears not the warnings of God in His Word, in His Church, in His inward appeals to conscience; it speaks not to God in prayer; it has neither the clear-sightedness nor the heart to pray; it is cold, so cold as to strike into every faculty a deadly chill, and, like Lazarus, it has already passed into a state of moral putrefaction, so long has it lain in the grave. And when such a soul hears the voice of the Son of God, when its eyes are open to behold His justice and His love, when it opens its ears to His warnings and His promises, when it opens its mouth to pray and to praise Him as the Author, the Redeemer, the Sanctifier of his life, when such a soul exchanges its corruption for purity, its coldness for the glow of warm affections, bursts the bondages of habit and passes forth through the barriers that would fain detain it into light and freedom; when men around behold this, and note further how in such a soul risen and beautified love has taken the place of hatred, joy of sullen discontent, peace of restlessness, and long-suffering of an impatience with others and with God that knew no bounds, and faith of a distrust alike of man and of God, and temperance of a perfect chaos of insurgent passions—when they see the man who dwelt yesterday among the graves, sitting to-day among the pure, clothed and in his right mind, and ask, "Who has done it? Who has thus changed that which offers to his will a much more stubborn resistance than the dust of a buried corpse, or the stone which closes the mouth of the sepulchre?" it is clear what must be the answer—who but He who, at the grave of Bethany, announced Himself as the Resurrection and the Life, and bade Lazarus come forth from his tomb, and whose own resurrection is not merely an outward power to mould our thoughts, but an inward power to transform our very souls and characters? When the old Christians whom Saul of Tarsus had so cruelly wronged beheld his converted life, his clear intelligence, his warm affections, his true and strong will all placed at the service of the Saviour whom he but now had persecuted, what did they do? He himself shall answer: "They glorified God in me." And when in the Church of our day a soul rises from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, there goes forth—oh! be sure of it—into hundreds and thousands of consciences around the proclamation of the Divine power of the Son of God. God grant that this Easter the heart of the risen and glorified Jesus may be gladdened by many such a moral resurrection, and that we who witness it, and through His grace experience it, may know more and more surely, to our endless peace, who He is and what He can do.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 10, 1890.

MISSIONARIES AND STATESMEN.

A BRIEF notice, in a London paper of extensive circulation and in ministerial confidence, informs the public that the correspondent at Rome signifies the fact of the recent negotiations, conducted by Sir J. L. Simmons, ending, among other results achieved, in the following:—That the foundations have been laid of a plan for making Malta a great centre for the despatch of English Catholic Missionaries to the East and Africa, in districts where the religious direction has hitherto been in the hands of foreign Missionaries. The English "Catholic Missionaries" alluded to must be of necessity those of the Roman Catholic persuasion, and "the foreign Missionaries" must include all German or other Missionaries of Reformed Churches. And the Government of Her Britannic Majesty have consummated this project, which is to apply to "districts in Africa and the East," of course including India. Now one must ask what has been for a long time, and what is up to this hour, the actual relationship of the British Government to the missions, say in India, conducted by the members of the Established Church of England as the national religion of this country? It is nearly fifty years ago since Daniel Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India, complained of the English being "in the false position of a Christian people hiding their Christianity and making themselves in some measure responsible for all the darkness and sin which they perpetuate." And not alone in respect of education but also of Missionary teaching, nay—even of beneficent action towards the female population of India, the same policy has been pursued and the same course of cold stand aloof exhibited in the eyes of the natives of India, to this very hour, to give proofs of all this, would fill pages as we find sources of information from every Governmental manifesto into which it could be thrust.

Then again as to Africa, many held, and with much appearance of true judgment, that the Portuguese difficulty was at bottom a religious question. What is to be said now of the Prime Minister of England and its Foreign Secretary making an arrangement by opening official relations in themselves of questionable legality and overt disloyalty in order to aid and abet the extension of an un-English and anti-English religion through India and through Africa, by Roman Missionaries, under the wing and state protection of England, and all this in detriment to the efforts of English missionaries of the English religion among these same native races. If the Prime Minister of England had notified to the Church Missionary Society that instructions had been given to all agents and bishops working under English Christianizing auspices that the policy of England was changed, and that England would cease to stand aloof as hitherto, and would back up the agents of the English reformed faith in every department in future, there would have been some attempt of at least fair play and no favour. But in the absence of this latter movement and in the presence of the former, who can deny that England has been made the stay of the Romish propaganda and the stumbling-block of the propagation of the Gospel. What next?

RITUALISM IN THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

(*From an Irish Correspondent.*)

WE have just now finished our General Synod. You in England are of course occupied about the coming decisions in the Lincoln case. But our interests are the same as yours, so you will like to know what we did, and with what success.

The Ritualistic prospects in Dublin were before the Synod. There are cases of crosses in churches, bowings towards the altar, etc. These cases were brought before the Synod. I think the event has been most satisfactory. The points we were most anxious about were two: Do the clergy profess to adore a corporal presence, and do they make private confession and absolution necessary in order to pardon? On these two points the representative of Ritualism in Dublin assured the Synod that the public mind may be at rest. This clergyman told the Synod that, though he bowed towards the Holy Table, he took care never to call it "altar"; he did so merely because it is an old custom, meaning that we look for the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, "the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come"; that for this reason alone he faced the East, or whatever point of the compass answered for it in any Church. He declared that he offered no such reverence, or any, to the Holy Table, or to anything upon it; and that if he should so declare in any court, it would be impossible for him to be condemned for any idolatrous

practice. This point being thus cleared, he came to private confession and absolution. He said he only heard those who came to him voluntarily to "open their grief," as the Prayer Book invites them; that he made private confession no condition in the case of communicants. In defence of his hearing voluntary confessions in such cases, he quoted long passages from Bucer, Ridley, Becon, Grindal, Hooker, and Ussher, as if such confession required any defence at all. Obligatory confession could find no support from such sources. What the Dublin press thinks of the effect of the debate is shown by an extract from the *Irish Times*, the organ of our business and sensible men. The day's paper for Saturday the 19th says:—"No schism is threatened . . . . upon the troublesome matter of ritualistic excess; a distinct gain can be chronicled as the result of the strong and necessary protest against that form of distraction. High churchmen who, at a former date, were almost defiant in tone and attitude, are now legitimately submissive to diocesan authority. They have given, at last, some ground for fixing a limit to apprehended innovations in allowing that what they had before adventured went over far. They now consent to restrictions and suffer control. The extent to which their departure from ritual uniformity has been altered may be insufficient, but it is something. It is a great deal to have established a principle which, we think, is now well asserted, that there must be ritual uniformity in a church which is not congregationalist, each church and each incumbent permitted to act on local choice. The manifest judgment of the Church in Synod is that the bounds, outside which enterprising Ritualists would desire to stray, are defined, and that transgressions of these will produce a resistance which they would be unable to confront. The doctrine of the Church has been declared afresh, and the common worship of the Church has been presented, as its bond of union essential to its retaining hold upon the mass of the population, at a time when the middle classes are becoming more the hope of the future."

Here we have common sense, and the estimate common sense takes of the effect of the debates in our Synod. It is not to be supposed that a clergyman would express such views on adoration of a corporal Presence and confession merely to throw dust in the eyes of the Synod. As his honest opinion and that of his party they are worthy of notice, and, we hope, of confidence. He spoke indeed of Eucharistic sacrifice, and of his elevation of cup and paten as an expression of belief. But we have no oblation, except of the bread and wine, and none of them after consecration; and all elevation is forbidden by Edward's First Book, the most ritualistic service book the Reformed Church ever put forth. In Ireland we have gone into extremes with our new Canons. But till repealed they must be obeyed. We are afraid of the sign of the Cross. We will not have the clergyman face in prayer otherwise than he does when he is preaching or reading lessons. We are afraid of turning to the East, or of bowing the head. This is all rank Puritanism. But it is only intensified by Popery posing as Ritualism. Every thing that savours of adoration of a corporal Presence, or the obligation to auricular confession and private absolution, only makes us the more determined to keep up all our absurd canons, as if they were necessary to protect us from Popery. But they have an opposite effect. Their absurdity extends itself to every protest against Romish doctrine or ritual. The difference between what is Catholic and what is Roman is lost sight of, and we are in danger of sacrificing Catholic truth to our horror of mediæval heresy.

PAULINUS OF NOLA.—A STUDY OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

By Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester.

(*Continued from page* 200.)

II.

Some specimens must now be given of the wonders wrought at the tomb of Felix, which converted our refined and pious Christian into an essential polytheist.

A poor peasant, who lived near Nola, had a pair of oxen, his only property, which he used to let out to his neighbours to plough their fields, and to cart their produce to the market. On one unhappy day he found his cow-house empty; some thief had evidently stolen his favourites. Instead of searching for them, or communicating with the police, he went straight to the church of Felix, and begged, or rather demanded, that the lost animals might be restored. He told the saint roundly that, since he was all-powerful and all-knowing, he had neglected his duty in permitting the theft, and that he must be looked upon as an accomplice of the robber; and he declared that he would never leave the church door without his beasts. Thus he prayed all day, and when night came, he laid himself down across the threshold. The cruel beadles, who came to close the temple for the night, moved him out of the way by force. Slowly and sadly he returned home, and laid himself down in the empty shed, where he could at least enjoy the smell of his lost favourites, for "a stink is no stink to one who loves"* At midnight he heard a rustling and pushing outside the door, and hastening to open it—behold there were the lost oxen, holding up their faithful noses to be kissed by their delighted master! Kind Felix had brought them home again.

The saint's power was strongly felt by the lower animals, which frequently offered themselves to him as voluntary sacrifices. Some farmers at Beneventum had carefully prepared and fattened a votive pig, which had thriven so well that it became too fat to walk, and too heavy for their means of conveyance. They therefore came to Nola without it, not knowing what excuse they could make to their patron. But when they reached the church door, the pig was there, waiting to be killed, and rejoicing to become a banquet for the poor. Other peasants in the neighbourhood of Nola had vowed a heifer. On the day of sacrifice, when they tried to yoke her to the cart which was to carry them to the temple, she obstinately refused to be caught. But when they had supplied her place with a pair of bullocks, and had started on their journey, she ran sportively alongside of them, and when they reached the place of sacrifice, gladly resigned her life. She had only desired to be a free-will offering.

The self-devotion of the dumb animals put to shame the sordid selfishness of many human beings. A farmer of Abella had promised to dedicate a pig, the

* Fœtor non fœtet amanti.

fame of whose size and fatness had spread through all the neighbourhood. The poor, the old men, the hoary-headed mothers, had assembled in the church —three long tables full of them, waiting with gaping mouths for the coming feast. The man arrived, he killed his pig, he cut it up, and then he cooked nothing for the poor but the inside and half the head. He packed the two sides upon his horse, and rode away, leaving the waiting guests in despair. But the rogue had reckoned without Felix. He had not gone a mile before he fell from his horse, and found that the use of his legs was quite gone. The horse thus liberated ran back to the temple with his load of pork, while the wounded man himself was carried thither by his companions. Arrived there, he ordered all the meat to be cooked for the poor, when at once the use of his limbs returned. Thus Felix got his offering, and the poor their dinner, and the selfish worshipper a lenient punishment, which displayed the clemency of the good saint.

Paulinus tells these stories with the keenest enjoyment of the ludicrous points which they contain. Like many other profoundly serious characters, he dearly loved a joke ; and so also did his patron. There was no lack of laughter among the blessed gods of that Elysium in which Felix dwelt, any more than in the halls of the old Olympus. One of the most attractive points in Paulinus's character is his innocent playfulness. He puns pleasantly on the names of all his friends. Pinianus will be like the pine-tree, beautiful, fruitful, lofty, fragrant, evergreen ; Aper is not a boar of the wild forest, but of the fruitful gospel field ; the boy, Asterius, will shine like a star in heaven ; Memor must mind to remember him, and he will never forget Memor. Delphinus, who baptized him, is the dolphin who has carried him safe through the waters ; and so on. He is affectionately fond of the lower class of people by whom he is surrounded, such as the letter carriers who bore his correspondence to friends in Gaul, and Spain, and Africa, and tenderly indulgent to their weaknesses, from which he derived constant amusement. One of his special favourites was Cardamas, an old man who had lived through many changes. He had been in early life a slave and an actor of pantomimes, and, even when converted to Christianity, retained, among other infirmities, a great love of wine, to which his rubicund complexion bore evident witness. While an inmate of the monastic establishment at Nola, he submitted manfully to the ascetic diet there prevailing ; and it was a constant amusement to his host to observe the gradual fading of the roses of his cheeks, and to think how he would compensate himself for this unwonted abstinence, when he got away on his homeward journey. However, Cardamas improved under the saintly influence of his employers. The last we hear of him is that Delphinus, Bishop of Bordeaux, admitted him to the ranks of the clergy, and made him an exorcist, in which character Paulinus expects that he will prove "very formidable to the demons." Whether he deals with things terrestrial, celestial, or infernal, he always must have his joke.

Although Paulinus had given out of his own patrimony almost all that his saint possessed, he nevertheless treated him as his landlord,* and himself as a steward. Now it is well known that every landowner has a Naboth's vineyard, a piece of ground just wanted to make the property complete. Neither landlord Felix, nor, in spite of all his amiability, land-agent Paulinus was exempt from this temptation. Just outside of the principal door of the great basilica, blocking the entrance, obstructing the view, and spoiling the effect of the buildings, were two poor wooden thatched cottages, which the possessor, like Naboth of old, said he would rather die than leave. Like any Irish land-agent of our time, Felix's faithful steward shrunk from causing odium by evicting an obstinate tenant, though he had the legal power. But one night one of the cottages was found to be on fire ; and there were strong suspicions that the fire was supernatural, and Felix himself the incendiary. The poor owner, and the neighbours, in vain threw water on the flames ; the fire went on increasing until Paulinus himself, having first offered a prayer, with his face upon the ground before his saint's tomb, came forward bearing a fragment of the true cross, which had been brought by Melania from the Holy Land, and held it like a shield between himself and the burning cottage. After this the fire gradually subsided ; and the poor cottager, repenting of his obstinacy, began to demolish the remains of his dwelling, and gave up peaceable possession of the premises to the saint. Paulinus relates the story with great triumph, and with no pity, the only unamiable trait we have found in his character.

(*To be continued.*)

* Dominœdius.

Reviews and Notices.

THE OLD DOCUMENTS AND THE NEW BIBLE. By Rev. J. Paterson Forsyth, etc. London : Bagster & Sons. 1890.

THIS book is a credit to the author, to his *Alma Mater*, and to Ireland. Its design is to defend the Old Testament in these days of rebuke and blasphemy. The text contains much information on matters little understood, as the Massorites, the Talmud and the Targums, the Pentateuch of the Samaritans, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Sextine, and the Clementine. But the most novel part of the book is the photographs of the Moabite Stone and eleven other subjects, such as one has never seen before in any popular book within the reach of ordinary readers. The author tells us (p. 176) how Pope Sextus brought out a new version of the Vulgate and called it infallible ; how this infallible version was found full of errors ; how Pope Clement brought out a new one, better than the infallible. "Will it be believed that the Jesuit morality decided on a deliberate untruth as the only way out of the difficulty? . . . . 'Either the printers were to blame, or somebody else,' said they. But in the Preface to the new edition brought out under Pope Clement VIII., the 'somebody else' was left out altogether, and the whole blame of the Papal blunders was saddled on the unfortunate printer."

"CHURCH OR CHAPEL" : an Eirenicon. By Rev. Joseph Hammond, LL.B., B.A. London : Gardner, Darton & Co.

ACTING on the recommendation of the Lambeth Conference that "*Information* should be disseminated respecting the standards of doctrine and the formularies of the Anglican Church," the writer has given us here the result of many years wrestling with the objections to conformity which lie at the root, and

spread out in the branches of those unhappy divisions which make the Christian religion a stumbling stone to the infidel and the sceptic, while to the devout Nonconformist they are equally with the Churchman a matter for sorrow and shame. The first part of the book, headed "Of the Church," deals with what the Church of Christ *is*, and *is not*. It proves in the clearest manner that the Church under old and new covenants is one and the same—continued, not reconstituted. That it is visible, and because described as the Body must be also tangible. That, being *one* body, it cannot consist of an unlimited number of bodies or churches; nor of a Church invisible within a church visible alone, but of both, one in paradise, the other on earth. Nor can the former mean the *good* people only, the *soul* of the Church, as it were; for then would all our Lord's teaching entirely mislead us when He left us the parables of the Tares, Draw Net, Marriage Feast, and Ten Virgins, and the words of St. John xv. 1-10. It shows in the most forcible manner that all baptised Nonconformists are members of *the* Church—not *a* church, by virtue of a ticket of membership, and that, call themselves what they please, they are only *societas*, not *ecclesia*, which latter God alone can form, not man. The Romish taunt of *Ubi Petrus ibi ecclesia* is well handled, and the visibility of the Head shown to be unnecessary; whilst on the opposite side, under the title of "Marks of the Church," a splendid refutation is given to the claim that piety and success constitute a church. The tables are then turned upon the Dean of Peterborough, when he asserts that we put "organisation before life." If his view, and that of most Nonconformists, that *Ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia* be correct, then the churches of Laodicea, Sardis and Thyatira could not have been properly speaking churches, though Christ Himself calls them so! Professor Beet's plea that "The necessities of the work of God compelled the Wesleyans to assume the position of an independent Church" is dissected and shown to stand on the same footing as the Jesuits and the Salvationists', and that it is only necessary to say with this learned professor that "the New Testament writers did not foresee the circumstances of to-day," to justify any extravagance. The chapter on "The Church of England not a sect" is a very good paper on the true relation of Church to king and State, and the remainder of the first part is devoted to taking the ground from under the feet of Nonconformists. In several other places they are likewise condemned out of the mouths of their own leaders, as for instance on p. 56, where Dr. Fairbairn is adduced as a witness for the visibility of the Church, Dr. Davidson who condemns the splitting up of Congregationalists into "patches and shreds," Dr. Dale, who says that in the first age every Church "stood apart," whereas the Congregationalist Year Book for 1871 confesses that the churches in Apostolic days recognised their interdependence" (pp. 60, 61). We are shown how the grounds upon which Nonconformists formerly separated from the Church are now not only allowed by them but maintained—*e.g.*, the surplice, marriage-ring, ornate and beautiful churches, etc., and that those whom Nonconformists most revere, as Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon held some of those doctrines which are now supposed to form an insuperable barrier between them and the Church. The second part of this handy and succinct volume is designed to remove those hindrances which are presented by the teaching of the Prayer Book. Under "Doctrines" are treated the Ministry, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Confirmation, and Absolution. Under "Rites and Offices" come the uses of Liturgical forms, the Athanasian Creed, the Burial Service, Commination, and Consecration. In the last section are some excellent articles upon the Established Church, Tithes, etc., and an answer to the question "What Justifies Secession?" We find throughout these pages a conciseness and, at the same time, a thoroughness in the treatment of the points of difference, combined with a pleasing style and an occasional dash of humour which are essential in a work that aims at reaching the intelligent reader of all classes. The absence of all bitterness and everything likely to offend those who are not unwilling to hear *the truth*, whether Churchmen or Nonconformists, is a strong recommendation. It will be found useful both by the clergyman in quest of a summary of Church teaching to put into the hands of inquiring parishioners, and by all who desire to know what is the right answer to common objections against the Church in her teaching, polity, and ordinances.

We have also received from the same publishers a large size picture book for children called "Heroes in Africa," in which the colouring is very good, and the illustrations give a vivid representation of some of the scenes through which Livingstone, Stanley, and Gordon must have passed. It aims at setting before young people the horrors of the slave trade, the good service done by explorers, and the peaceable work of the missionaries. It contains animals, natives, river warfare, etc., in abundance, and Stanley takes a prominent place among the coloured men and women. It is a good specimen, and well got up.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

JUDGE WARREN'S PAMPHLET.

Sir,—I have read your review of Judge Warren's pamphlet; having previously read the pamphlet itself. Will you permit me to make the following remarks?

What is stated in the pamphlet respecting the punctuation of the answer in the catechism, in all old Prayer Books, is entirely true. There is a comma at *sign*, and there is a comma at *grace*. I am of opinion that this makes *sign* the antecedent of *given* as well as of *ordained*, of which last I suppose there is no question. But I am not of opinion that any doctrinal argument can properly be based on this.

The review says that the pamphlet confounds regeneration and conversion. I have searched the pamphlet, and have been unable to find the term *conversion* in it; at all events, if that term is there at all, it is not so prominent as to bear out the supposition of your reviewer. Indeed, the latter seems to me to contrast the two terms in a way that is not justified by their meanings. Regeneration is a new birth, the initiation of a new condition; conversion is an act of a person who turns, or converts himself, from evil to good. There is nothing in common between the nature of a condition and the nature of an act. To speak of conversion as a condition is usual enough, but it is illogical and has no Scriptural warrant.

Both the pamphlet and the review fall into an error about the decision in the Gorham case; an error more unpardonable in an eminent lawyer than in one who is probably unacquainted with law and its forms.

The pamphlet gives, as the decision in the Gorham case, a summary of the reasoning by which the majority of the judges arrived at the judgment. That judgment was, that the Bishop of Exeter should institute Mr. Gorham; and by necessary inference, that the latter's doctrine is not contrary to the doctine of the Church. But the judgment does not lay down that that doctrine is the doctrine of the Church, nor does it define what the doctrine of the Church is. Indeed, the Church admits the entertaining of a nearly unlimited diversity of view on baptism.

I am of opinion that the pamphlet contains two errors, one of which your reviewer does not notice, and the other of which he in some measure adopts. In speaking of the two parts of a sacrament, Judge Warren, not in so many words so much as by assumption that is quite apparent, treats *part* as if it involves divisibility. Etymologically it does, no doubt, but not necessarily so in meaning. I say without hesitation, that *part*, in the Catechism, is not the same as *part* in Euclid's definitions. Neither is it so in legal language, nor when we speak of the *part* which a person takes. On this logical error or oversight there depends a good deal of the unsound reasoning of the pamphlet. The review does not notice this at all.

The other error, which pervades the pamphlet, and which the review appears to adopt, is an assumption that there is no alternative between the author's view of baptism and the Romish doctrine of the *opus operatum*. Now the doctrine taught by the late Dr. Pusey, as also by Bishop O'Brien, quoted by Judge Warren, held probably by the vast majority of the English clergy, and by a very large portion of the Irish, a doctrine consistent in its every particular with the Bible and with our church services, is not the Romish *opus operatum* doctrine. The latter involves that the regeneration imparted in baptism confers certain personal graces, which may be forfeited by mortal sin. The true spiritual doctrine is, that regeneration introduces into a spiritual condition with its blessings and obtainable graces; while this spiritual condition, though susceptible of abuse, cannot be forfeited except by sentence of Him who introduced the offender into the condition of grace. This is as far removed from the Romish doctrine as it is from that which teaches that baptism is a mere, almost an empty, form, while it is not a middle way between them, being higher and deeper than both. I regret to see your reviewer exhibiting what must be either a leaning towards the Romish view, or complete ignorance of what he treats of, which ignorance I suppose it is more charitable to impute to him than sympathy with Romanism.

B.

April 28th, 1890.

[We have received from the Right Hon. Judge Warren a caveat against our review of his pamphlet, *Ex opere operato*, to which we feel bound to reply. The Judge seems to deny what is termed the Charitable Hypothesis. But the question is, what is it that he so denies? We can understand that he repudiates the idea that any infants are regenerated in baptism. But that is not the charitable hypothesis at all. It is that infants will be hereafter regenerated, that is, converted. This is the idea of the Gorham decision. *It* says "regeneration, meaning conversion, may take place before, in, or after baptism," which must mean that conversion may follow infant baptism, and may take place before, in, or after adult baptism. The Judge refers us to pp. 42, 43, for his repudiation of the charitable hypothesis; but we do not find that he repudiates it, as he says. On the contrary, he seems to hold it. He makes repentance and faith so vitally necessary, in order to the grace of baptism, that he, in effect, disqualifies all infants. He says that he understands the regeneration of the services to mean "the death unto sin, and the new birth unto righteousness," of the fifth answer of the Catechism. As the services assert, and thank God for, this gift, as having taken place in baptism, must not the Judge hold the charitable hypothesis, that is, that something has actually taken place, or at least is about to take place hereafter? We ask the Judge to say how, in the baptism of an already converted adult, he can pray for his regeneration, meaning that that already converted adult may then be converted over again, which is what he means by his "dying unto sin and rising again unto righteousness"? We might also ask how he can assert such a change of the infant, who cannot possibly have either faith or repentance. All is explained on our theory, and on that alone, that the death unto sin means our sharing in Christ dying unto sin once, and our rising again unto righteousness means our having grace to lead a righteous life. Being made "children of grace" is the synonym for this death and new birth, which seems to us to settle the whole question. The Judge may say that he has not used the term conversion as equivalent with regeneration. But as he explains regeneration to mean "a death unto sin, etc.," he must use these latter words as tantamount to conversion, unless he explains them as we have done above.—ED.]

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—Referring to an interesting review in this week's PULPIT, I should like to say that Mr. Thring is not the only person who has deemed Darwinism "nursery babble." Thus Lord Chancellor Hatherley spoke of "the folly of this stuff," and Carlyle called it "deluded insanity." Your reviewer's statement that Darwin's theory "has in the end obtained the support of every biologist" seems to be irreconcilable with the facts. Darwin does not seem to have succeeded in convincing any of those who were the leaders of science when his book was published in 1859. Some of those leaders were strenuous opponents. Professor Owen rejected his theory. Professor Sedgwick wrote a long letter of remonstrance, and Sir John Herschel called it the "Law of Higgledy Piggledy." No doubt many scientists of this new generation, which has grown up under the teaching of Professor Huxley, take a different view. It was Professor Huxley who, by his anonymous and enthusiastic review of several columns in the *Times*, first gave Darwin's book its πού στῶ. On the other hand, many very eminent living scientific men are against the theory; for instance, Sir George Stokes, President of the Royal Society, and Sir T. W .Dawson, a recent President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Dr. Carruthers, President of the Linnæan Society, states that the whole testimony of the vegetable kingdom is opposed to evolution. Sir William Thomson denies the possibility of those vast geological ages which are the first postulate of the Evolutionist and Professor Max Müller comes forward to point out that language constitutes an insuperable barrier between man and beast.

The words of a recent writer in the *Edinburgh*

Review are well worthy of attention: "Darwin's influence has been more hostile to Theism than that of any other writer since the foundation of Christianity itself. He repudiated creation, abjured design, and enthroned unreason as Lord of the Universe. He violated the deepest instincts of humanity, and opened a door to Atheism." A good many of that large body of people, who prefer common sense to "science falsely so-called," will agree with this writer when he adds: "That Darwin should have swayed opinion for thirty years is a reproach to the age; but the system has had its day. Men are rising up who will destroy it."

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 29th, 1890.

P.S.—When your reviewer complacently observes that "Biologists do not profess to be able to explain the ultimate facts on which the theory rests," and that "the universe remains not less but more full of mystery and wonder in view of the Darwinian theory," one is tempted to ask why the Evolutionists cannot leave us in peace, if they are so wholly unable to answer these deep questions which arise in the heart of every thinking man who has to live and to die?

RELIGION.

SIR,—As in "C. I. W.'s" letter relegated is to be corrected to religated. This accompanying extract from Max Müller's "Natural Religion." will show *e* is more correct than *i*—see pages 33 and 35.

Lactantius "we are bound to God (religati) by the bond of piety"; from this religion has received its name, and not as Cicero has interpreted it from attention (a relegendo) 35, the real objection to our deriving *religio* from *religare* is the fact that in classical Latin *religare* is never used in the sense of binding back—Cicero's etymology is therefore decidedly preferable, viz., those who carefully took in hand the worship of the gods were called *religiosi* from *relegere*, as neat people (elegantes) were so-called from *elegere* to pick out, etc.

P. 43. Religion is said to be knowledge, and is said to be ignorance—is said to be freedom, then dependance—is said to be desire, then freedom from desires. Religion is said to be silent contemplation, then stately worship of God. People take every kind of liberty with this old word; but see Epistle of St. James i. 27.

E. E.

DR. LITTLEDALE ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

SIR,—Your correspondent "B." includes me, I suppose, amongst those whose knowledge of the present theory of the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is still very defective. Although I trust I am always willing to learn, yet I am not quite prepared to acknowledge that Rome has abandoned her theory of transubstantiation. The Black Rubric was written both against that theory and any adoration of the sacramental elements; and accordingly, should that theory be abandoned, some modification of the words might be considered necessary to meet the change, whilst in any case the direction against adoration remained unaltered. Most persons would perhaps admit that the *actual* abandonment of the notion of substance, by both the Anglican and Roman churches, would necessarily change the differences of doctrine concerning the Eucharist between the two communions, though not of necessity therefore creating agreement, as some readers of Dr. Littledale's tract might suppose, the learned writer inferred. But even were it the fact that the absolute abandonment of the doctrine of transubstantiation was acknowledged by Rome as practically accepted, the whole doctrine of the Mass remains, and the adoration of the Host, which not only "goes perilously near" to idolatry, but is such pure and simple, and is, were it possible, on the increase than otherwise.

If Dr. Littledale's arguments were based on the denial of the idea of substance as a thing in itself (and I admit it seems to me it was), why bring in the word when stating the Anglican doctrine, that "they remain in ther natural substances," because surely if the elements have natural substances to remain in, then the present received Romish doctrine, according to Dr. Littledale, cannot agree with the Anglican, while the latter holds belief in the notion of any substance? At the risk of iteration, I may add that Dr. Littledale might have meant by "in their natural substances" simply in their reality; but this brings us no nearer agreement, as Rome always held that all the accidents of the elements remained the same. It was never my intention to prove the late Dr. Littledale either "ignorant, foolish or dishonest"; but surely the most learned may sometimes err, even with the best possible intentions.

As long as England adheres to her formularies and Trent doctrine is not authoritatively changed, any similarity or agreement is impossible, as far as transubstantiation is concerned. And even were it desirable, that on Dr. Littledale's hypothesis, any apparent agreement could be established between the two churches, the existing differences on other matters of faith are such, that no real benefit could accrue from the abandonment of one tenet of doctrine, while these remain.

INQUIRENS.

MR. GLADSTONE AS LECTOR.

SIR,—I am requested by Dr. Mills, the Vicar of St. Michael's, Coventry, to state that the announcement made in the daily papers and Church weeklies that Mr. Gladstone was asked to read a lesson at the service on April 22nd was incorrect. He *was* invited to attend; but on such an occasion, and with so large a number of clergy present, Dr. Mills would certainly not have asked any layman, however distinguished, to act as Lector.

JOHN NAPLETON.

Wymington Rectory, Higham Ferrers,
29th April, 1890.

THE MEDICAL LANGUAGE OF ST. LUKE.

SIR,—In your last issue "F. T. P." observes: "Happily there survives an epistle of the first century by a Gentile hand, in which many of the linguistic peculiarities of St. Luke appear. I allude to the first Epistle of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians. . . His Epistle is saturated with the LXX.; quotations from it more, or less correct, fill about one third; like St. Luke Hebraisms appear." Why does "F. T. P."

call Clement "a Gentile hand," when the late Bishop Lightfoot was of opinion that Clement was "of Jewish or proselyte parentage"? "There can be little doubt," says Bishop Westcott, "that he occupied a position corresponding to that of St. Peter in the first age. He was the acknowledged mediator between the Judaising and Gentile believers and the first legislator of the Christian society. How could a Gentile have any influence with the Judaisers?" As to proselyte "parentage," we must not forget what another learned Doctor, Lightfoot, has quoted from the Babylonian *Gemara*: "He is no proselyte until he be circumcised and baptised." With regard to St. Luke, Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out that he was "a Gentile Christian," and (on Col. iv. 14) he says, "St. Luke is here distinguished from οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς"—they of the circumcision. "This alone is fatal to his identification with the Lucius, St. Paul's kinsman, *i.e.*, a Jew."

It is clear therefore that "F. T. P's" argument founded on the similarity of style and phraseology between Clement's Epistle and the Third Gospel really favours my contention that the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts was, like Clement, a Jew. Hence it is *quite impossible* that this author could have been Luke "the beloved physician" who was a Gentile. . . I cannot but agree with "F. T. P." when he says: "In religion this influence of authority is at its greatest. Our Authorised Version, with its quaint phraseology, misspelt words, and mistranslations has exercised a marvellous influence on our English tongue. The very sound of the wording of the good Old Version, familiar to our ears as household words, is endeared to us by use. The sanctity which doth hedge about a sacred book is strong enough to override grammar, philology, and modern style." What a capital account is this of the Authorised Version of the Jewish Scriptures in the Apostolic age, namely, the Septuagint.

And why is it that our English Bible has "exercised such a marvellous influence on our English tongue"? Is it not because it has been constantly read in the hearing of the people—read to them week by week, year after year, from the early days of impressible childhood? But while our English churches are wide open to welcome all comers, the Jewish synagogue, where the LXX. was read every Sabbath, (Acts xiii. 15 xv., 21), was (as it still is) fast barred to all but the circumcised Jew, or the equally circumcised proselyte. We have St. Peter's authority for saying that "it was an unlawful thing for a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation" (Acts x. 28). The author of the Third Gospel, like all who wrote in Hellenistic (that is, *Hebraistic*) Greek, had from childhood drunk in the familiar phraseology of the Septuagint. He was therefore a *born* Jew, and nothing else. I have collected most abundant proofs of this, but I will not now stay to set them forth. I have some observations to make another day respecting the medical writers. Meanwhile, I will now only thank "F. T. P." for his pleasant letter, and as to his task with Galen, wish him *bon voyage*.

H. HEBER EVANS.

April 29th, 1890.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

THE Central Council of Diocesan Conferences at its recent meeting in London, presided over by Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., recommended Burial Reform as a special subject for discussion at Diocesan Conferences.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Airy, Rev. Basil R., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Torquay; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Yorkshire.
Anderton, Rev. Arthur, Senior Curate of Bury; Rector of St. John Evangelist's, Miles Platting.
Askey, Rev. Arthur Henry, M.A., Vicar of Holton-le-Clay, Lincolnshire.
Baggallay, Rev. F., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Weymouth.
Bailey, Rev. John Allanson, M.A., Vicar of Weston, near Bath.
Baillie Rev. W. Gordon, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Tyndall's-park, Bristol; Vicar of St. Peter's, Newnham.
Beechey, Rev. St. Vincent, Jun., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bolton-le-Sands; Rural Dean of Tunstal.
Cockett, Rev. W. H., Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's, Addingham, Cumberland.
Dalton, Rev. W. E., Vicar of Glynde, Sussex.
Fuller, Rev. Morris, M.A., Rector of Ryburgh; Vicar of Bishop's Lawton, Devon.
Gardiner, Rev. Thory Gage, M.A., Rector of All Saint's, Colchester.
Harrison, Rev. J. B., M.A., Rector of Paulerspury; Rural Dean of Preston Second Deanery.
Lambert, Rev. James Higley, M.A., Rector of Pencombe, Herefordshire.
Long, Rev. G. E., M.A., Curate of Melksham; Vicar of Edington, Wilts.
Macdonald, Rev. J. Middleton, B.A., Chaplain of Exeter College, Oxford; H.M. Junior Chaplain on the Bengal (Calcutta) Establishment.
Moberly, Rev. Robert Campbell, M.A., Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.
Price, Rev. Augustine R., B.A., Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.
Roney-Dougal, Rev. J. C., B.A., Vicar of Castle Donington, Derby.
Watkin-Davies, Rev. F. P., M.A., Vicar of Llanfachreth; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Merionethshire, Mr. C. E. J. Owen, Hengwrtucha.
Wood, Rev. Robert, M.A., Vicar of Bickley, Kent.
Woosnam, Rev. Charles Maxwell, M.A., Chaplain to the Mersey Mission to Seamen; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of Newtown, Hants, at Roffeyhurst, Horsham, on the 2nd inst., aged 45.
Benson, Rev. Henry, at Farncombe Rectory, Godalming, on the 26th ult., aged 60.
Cameron, Rev. Archibald Evan, Curate of Mottram-in-Longendale at 6, Sheil-road, Fairfield, Liverpool, on the 29th ult.
Collyer, Rev. Thomas, M.A., for fifty-six years Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bungay, and thirty-nine years Rector of Gislingham, at Gislingham Rectory, on the 2nd inst., aged 90.
Davy, Rev. Archibald, suddenly at Wincle Vicarage, Macclesfield, on the 5th inst., aged 57.
Griffiths, Rev. Walter, B.D., at Dylais Fach, Neath, Glamorganshire, on the 28th ult., aged 55.
Kyle, Ven. Samuel Moore, formerly Archdeacon of Cork, at 37, Upper Fitzwilliam-street, Dublin, on the 1st inst., aged 89.
Lay, Rev. Henry Reeve, formerly Rector of Holdgate, on the 4th inst.
Owen, Rev. Henry, M.A., late Rector of Llangefni, Anglesea, at Upper Bangor, on the 2nd inst., aged 93.
Thorp, Rev. Gervase, at Ipswich, on the 20th ult., aged 60.
Tyler, Rev. Charles Henry, M.A., Rector of Rodney Stoke, on the 29th ult., aged 77.
Watson, Rev. George Bowes, M.A., formerly Vicar of St. Neot's, and late Vicar of St. Mary's, Oatlands, in London, on the 3rd inst., aged 50.
Willson, Rev. Edward Nicholas, A.K.C., for nearly ten years Vicar of St. Paul's, Southwark, at St. Paul's Vicarage, 94, Lambeth-road, on the 17th ult., aged 66.

The Church of England Pulpit.

BUILDING—ANCIENT AND MODERN.

By the Archbishop of CANTERBURY.

Sermon Preached at the Re-opening of St. Michael's Church, Coventry, on Tuesday, April 22nd, 1890.

"Thus they did day by day, and gathered money in abundance. . . . . So the workmen wrought, and the work was perfected by them, and they set the House of God in its state, and strengthened it."—2 Chron., xxiv. 11, 13.

THE irresistible influences which a great religious building exercises over the individual soul at the very sight of it, and much more in the hour of worship, do not exhaust the power of it. We must be naturally or wilfully insensible to the inner meanings of things, if, looking on them, and dwelling perhaps under the shadow of them, we do not draw in some sense of what made the greatness of the society which so far surpassed us in conception and in the fulfilment of conceptions, if we never warm towards the feeling that perchance we ourselves are bound to contribute, not only to keep up and heighten the ideals, but strengthen the works of the society of which we are part. The disciples expressed their awe in sight of the temple: "Master, see what great stones and what manner of building are here. What has our Messiahship and apostleship before it that can compare to this?" And the Master himself owned it in word and deed. But what was to be said on the other side was that this kind of power was not inexhaustible. The hold of the temple on men's souls was nearly exhausted even then. It was in its evening splendour; never so brilliant as now that it was hasting to extinction. The sublime influences of the most perfect shrine must not only *be*, they must also be used, and they must be used well. Their associations must be of holiness, of liberty, of charity, of serviceableness to mankind, or else they will soon become dreamy and be despised. I am here because I would gladly witness to you, its possessors, of the individual spell I speak of in your own stateliest, fairest church. Often coming here as a boy with boy friends, specially with one of the holiest, and purest, and strongest of boys, as he became one of the noblest of scholars and bishops, till he lately passed from our side, I will say without fear that the power of this church entered in, and became part of our best store—part of ourselves. Not its mere beauty of feature only—the mystery of its aisles and chapels; the jet with which it launches itself towards the sailing clouds; the dimness of its white saints in its deep red tower, worn like a sea rock, made it seem charged with a message which it could not deliver without an effort of ours to be good and wise enough to take it in. Does anyone question my report of it as too strong on one side or not deep enough on the other? If St. Michael's has stronger, tenderer meanings to him, that is his gain. If it has no voice, nor language, nor sound for him, who would not pity him? Your city joys with you to-day, your Bishop, your Diocesan Clergy, your Lord-Lieutenant, your Chief Magistrate in his dignity, many brethren who parted in some things, joy religiously in your joy. It is upon their assembling about you that I come here to say what I have said, and then to build something upon it. That I thought was the best way in which I could be a helper of your joy to-day, for joy you ought to have, and to let no cynicism and no dissatisfaction spoil it. There is a reason which lies at the root of men's reverence for and men's love of the memorials of old. Our affection for them gives us a kind of right in them, and then they bind us to things larger and more stable than our brief position here. We are surrounded by so vast a world of space and time, and we have so little contact, so minute a touch with it. We talk, and we talk truly, of the world of politics, the world of nature, the world of science, the world of commerce, the world of fashion, even the world of religion. Each idea creates a practical world to itself, taking in many classes of society in all countries, spreading backward into many centuries of history, and each of these worlds of men charged with a future. Well, how like a speck is the place of any man in any one of these worlds, even if he is for a few years a leader; but for one leader there are tens and hundreds of thousands who only swim with the stream, and they each of them look out with interest upon as much as they can see of these other worlds, as they are called, even while they are absorbed in their own. And they can see very little. They cannot, as we say, "enter into" the world of another man. When we have thought of all these worlds in our own great world, we lift up our eyes to the stars, and what is this world of worlds in comparison with the infinity of those shining worlds of space which we cannot enter into at all. With God's world as it really is how infinitely small is the connection of any one of us. Or we think of the ages to come, and of how we are absolutely nothing to them, even as the past could not know us, and we fall back humbled into our little place, but thankful for that which builds us in with other worlds of men of the past and in the future, with purposes which have some endurance, and which anchor our moment to at least something greater before it and after it—a glorious shrine, witnessing to us that, in the highest region of all, our faith, our creed, our repentance, our forgiveness, our need, our supplication, are the

same as of those who have gone before, and of those who will come after—of those who were here so long ago, who loved what we love, and hoped what we hope, and feared whom we fear, and reared us monuments which will not let us forget, and gave them to be absolutely our own as they were theirs. This gives us at once permanence and humility, stability and reverence. There has been till of late no limit to the interest which the Englishman has had in his forefathers. Only since we began to think our children should know fragments of every science, and every craft, we have been so busy that we have given up teaching them history and citizenship. But it will come back, and generally the Englishman still loves to know what are his duties as an Englishman, and how they came to be his duties. And so, taking his stand by a church like this, he will care to know how it is but the much younger daughter of a vast cathedral establishment which was devoured by secular greed, and has disappeared. He will take pleasure in realising that the fair lands which spread around him were the centre of an ancient kingdom, which stood as a bulwark and a mediator between a furious north and south; a kingdom which prospered in days when Angles and Danes were melting into one. Nay, it will delight him to know that one from Canterbury brought hither a vain relic indeed, but one which cost him in Italy a talent of gold and a hundred talents of silver, and that even this poor relic was a talisman which drew men together who could not as yet separate the material from the spiritual, and encouraged them to live in peace. In all the past he will take as much interest as if he understood it, because just so much as his heart and his culture enable him to understand is sufficient to make him feel that he has received much, and is bound to hand on more. If he will next think that this existing church is the daughter or grand-daughter of that old cathedral, and represents a wholly different age, and that it incorporated many fresh ideas which are living still, he will more and more strongly feel that Christian men have not lived unto themselves, and that he must not. For this church represents in reality the sanctification of commerce. It belongs to an age of business—business on a smaller scale, but not the least less energetic than the business of to-day, no less enterprising in grappling with difficulties. Look round you, and see the chapels of all those merchant and trade guilds. When those were built there were other older guilds existing still which had simply religious objects or purposes of mutual protection for person or for property. They had lasted on with all their observances. But here you had a wholly different class: the Drapers' Chapel and the Mercers' Chapel and the Cappers' and the Dyers' and the Smiths' and the Girdlers' Chapels—each wealthy trade dedicating itself by solemn worship and sacred ties to God's service "as to the Lord and not unto men." Here every Friday came the Mayor of the city with all his officers to offer special prayer to "Jesus" our Lord before he went to open and preside over the market. It may be that the political economy of these mediæval guilds was not very advanced. It may be that their devotion had strange strains of superstition running through it. But they were at least promoting with all their might the best principles they knew—they were making great sacrifices for unity and for freedom; they were working out "good customs," as they called them, and insisting upon their being confirmed and chartered. In the absence of laws for the benefit of the poor they were founding and daily administering vast charities; and they were making it necessary for monarch after monarch to give his best attention to the third estate, often to visit them personally and to bring his parliament from time to time along with him. And over all that they were doing they wrote in legible inscription in the largest characters, "To the glory of God," and "In the faith of Jesus Christ." I dare say they erred in many things; still they aimed at truth and life. Add that among these very pillars, and in the small crowded streets which enclustered the church, there was at work a staff of four-and-twenty clergy under their Vicar, and that these were established not all at once, but one after another, and provided for by business men with practical aims. Against all this, set off what you will for mistaken policies, for superstitious ignorance, for false principles, is not the scene that remains, after you have made all your allowances, with its many busy figures moving about in it, merchants, lawyers, clergy, workpeople, a picture of activity, and a wonderful picture of self-devotion? They seem to me to resemble busy weavers weaving with all their might the web of England's inheritance. And their nearest heirs are yourselves. One who knew this city well wrote just thirty years ago that its "citizens are not more distinguished for the enlightened zeal which leads them to adopt every improvement in trade than for the care they bestow in the preservation of those venerable remains of antiquity with which their noble city abounds, connecting the present with the past." If your recent work brings that praise down to the present year, who can doubt that those "venerable remains" themselves, or rather the zeal and life which are perpetuated in them, have been very potent in the training of this present age. As we look back through that religious history of England in which the character of the people stands ever out most strongly, we see a zealous, self-denying life striving after great objects, unsubdued by a gradual inpouring of superstition and corruption, and foreign despotism. Then we see the salutary current of reformation setting in; and that tyrannous spoliation and wild reaction which, roused by its movement, flowed away from it like a dangerous backwater, could not drown it. A not purely fanatical or purposeless irreverence invaded

but could not overpower the inborn love of organised and well-ordered institutions, perpetually breathing new life into the old, and while seeking ever fresh expression, animating anew that which their fathers had loved. To inspire and to revive no less than to create is the secret of the stability which others have envied us. St. John's charge "to strengthen the things which remain, which are ready to die," commends itself naturally to England, though ancient Sardis could not learn the lesson. "Not to destroy, but to fulfil"—never to destroy, always to fulfil, is the teaching of experience and the hope of progress, as well as the mission of Christ. The false witnesses against Christ declared that He said, "I will destroy, and I will rebuild"—nay, they say it still; but what He really said was, "Others may destroy, I will rebuild, and I will rebuild quickly." That spirit which I fondly believe to be England's as well as Christ's, England's from Christ, has come down to us, we would also fain believe, unimpaired in true reverence for the past. True reverence for the past is to fulfil it, to recognise its far-sighted capacity, and to enable it to go on serving expansively. From spire to chapel we should misread this church of yours if we did not learn that principle from every stone. It was piled and it was enlarged in this wonderful way to meet the new needs of the people, to express their growing ideas, and to consecrate them all. If we think only of preserving and using that which we inherit we cannot do it. It slips stealthily away. Restoration itself obliterates. An inheritance and a tradition are no blessing if they make us selfish, narrow, contemptuous of what is younger and less well provided. Our ancestry may have left us forwarder than others, but we are fallen far behind others if the facts of the day in which we live come less home to us than the old facts of the days that are gone came home to them; if the facts of this day of Christ do not impress us more impressively than any recent days; if we do not hear Christ telling us to consider men's wants more decisively than in the Galilean uplands, "Give ye them to eat." We know that in Him we have an inexhaustible store. He distributes to His disciples, but they are to arrange, they are to travel up and down the lines, they are to distribute to the multitude. We are to perceive the needs of the day and hour. We are to labour to provide for them, and we are to rely on Christ that our labour shall not be in vain. Surely there are signs all around us that to assert high principles, to quicken our own enthusiasms, "to stir up the gift that is in us," is no unfruitful work, even while ways and means are problematical. I take one instance. These many years past good men have spoken and prayed about our religious differences, about Christ's words on unity, about the hopes of reunion, and have been sneered at for dreaming of things impossible. But has it been in vain? I say fearlessly, No, the work is going on. I acknowledge that there is as much bitterness as ever, that utterances are perhaps more stinging, and animosities more cruel, but I see this great difference. The bitterness and the animosity are no longer the sins of deeply religious men as once they were. They now make the stock-in-trade of the agitator and the political partisan. Religious men, as a rule, would spiritually wish to see eye to eye if intellectually they could. If that is true of this our day, Christ is winning. Again, the condition of the poor has at all times been very near to, has lain heavy on, the heart of the Church. But not at all times have economic science and the Church taken the same view of what ought to be done and attempted for them. But they have drawn men much nearer together. Economic science has been softened, elevated, Christianised. The religious world has learnt that the relief of their own feelings, or an immediate palliative of trouble, is not the end of almsgiving; has learnt that not the bodily wants only, nor the pains of the soul only, need her ministrations—that there is, so speak, a long way from body to soul, that if the intermediate region is uncared for neither body nor soul is lastingly benefited, that few are helped effectively until they are helped to self-help. This is a new form of moral criticism which clears up the spirit of the Gospel as scholarship clears up the letter of it, and they both belong to our day. Again, secular teachers have effectively convinced the world that secularism is no religion for the young, that education must be everywhere more truly in God's name, that a religious class of schools will never cease except by all schools becoming religious, and if religious at all, earnestly religious. Again, we are learning that a competition which lowers the standard of perfection is a loss to the world. We have long gone on believing that emulation was the secret of progress; we begin to see why the Apostle classifies emulation with envyings and jealousies as a destructive agent. We begin to perceive that cheapness costs the world very dear at the cost of excellence; that trades to be known at all must be well known; that it rests with us to bestow thoroughness, and to demand it. Now some such truths were rudely known when these chapels were built. The guilds insisted on some of them. In our day the same knowledge is coming back in fuller tide; it is our parts and duties to insist on real skill, and real care in wider, larger ways. And if such things as these lie in the Church's message to the world, more still do they lie in the Church's message to the Church. She must daily rise to her own development; daily inspire her own organisations with fresh breath of life. No part of her can say to another part, "I am clothed and warm, go you bare and cold." In her own history, simply read, she will see where her course lies: in self-forgetfulness, in sympathy, in generosity, her whole work has been done in the past, and must be done. Where these are not, she is not. It moves her to

see work languish; wheels failing to bite the rail for want of spiritual grip; forces wasted for want of organic structure and central impulse. It pains her to the quick to see a crying necessity unattempted to be met. It burdens her with a mute perplexity to hear of great efforts carelessly arrested, good desires stirred in men's minds and not brought to good effect. See then that you, dear people, know what you do in reproducing the frame and structure of the past. You do not mean to leave it a feebly animated, pulseless form, but one full of life and vigour and influence. You do not mean it to be like a district church of yesterday, only with vaster spaces pillared and roofed with more material. You prepare an organisation calculated to work it; you provide a motive power adequate to animate it. That is a task worthy of you and of your reputation. Nothing short of it will be.

THE TIME OF JACOB'S TROUBLE.

An Inquiry into the Purport of Revelation xii.

By the Rev. RALPH W. HARDEN, B.A.

Part I.

The Bible is not merely a record of the salvation of man, of his recovery from sin and final exaltation to glory. It is all this undoubtedly. But it is more. It looks back to a time when man was not. It reaches forward to reveal the eternal doom of him who is outside and above man, the unseen enemy of the race, "the devil that deceived them" (Rev. xx. 10). What is so often referred to as the *protevangelium*, or first promise of glad tidings to man (Gen. iii. 15), is far more properly a denunciation to Satan, a prophecy of undying hatred between the Serpent and the Woman and her seed, terminating at last in the crushing defeat of the Woman's foe. And this germ of prophecy is afterwards so consistently developed through every succeeding page of inspiration that the Bible might not inaptly be entitled, "The History of the War of Satan against the seed of the Woman," of which it might also further be said that its several chapters are successively presented to us as the five great epochs of Satanic manifestation upon earth. They are the following:—

First, at the era of the Flood, when the *Sons of God*, whom I hold to be the angels referred to by St. Jude (Jude 6), intermarried with the daughters of men. Again, in the time of the Egyptian bondage, when Satan energised the magicians to oppose to the miracles of Moses and Aaron their own equally real but diabolic wonders. The third is the period of Elijah's ministry, when that Prophet was commissioned to shut up, and to call down fire from, heaven against the truly Satanic idolatry of Baal. The fourth is our blessed Lord's own life-time, when, according to the Gospels, there was such an unwonted display of dæmoniac energy. And the last is that time yet to come, when, under the sway of the Beast and the False Prophet, miraculous powers shall be again exercised, not only by the servants of God, but by the delegated power of the Evil One.

Now, through all these several epochs we can trace with the greatest ease the one object aimed at by Satan—the extirpation of that seed of the woman through whom his own overthrow is finally to be brought about.

In the first period the apostasy of Cain and the persecution of the antediluvian saints are brought to a climax by the descent of these apostate angels to earth. But this is not all. The intermarriage of these with the daughters of men had well nigh so confused the angelic with the human nature as to preclude (save for the Divine intervention) the possibility of a Messiah born of a purely human parentage. Hence, probably the reason of God's choice of Noah, as being "perfect in his generations"* (Gen. vi. 9). That is to say, of pure descent and lineage. And hence, too, the necessity of the awful catastrophe of the Deluge to blot out this unnatural race for ever from God's earth. "For all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth" (Gen. vi. 13).

In the next attempt the power of Satan is concentrated upon the one nation on whom he discerns that God has bestowed "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh" (Rom. ix. 4, 5). The story of Exodus, recounting the rigorous service of the enslaved people, the two-fold edict of the Pharaoh against the lives of the newly-born sons, the opposing hate of the magicians, and, finally, the apparently inevitable destruction of the whole nation of Jehovah, leaves no doubt as to Satan's design against the chosen people.

The third assault—to the merely superficial reader, limited to the kingdom of Israel—is seen, on closer inspection, to be really planned for the destruction of the entire royal house of David. For with him God had established His everlasting covenant: "His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before Me" (Psa. lxxxix. 36). The marriage of Jehoram, Jehoshaphat's son, with Athaliah, the infamous daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, proved not only the means of introducing the corrupting idolatry of Baal into Judah, but actually became the instrument of the all but utter extinction of the entire royal lineage. First, the whole family of Jehoshaphat's sons fell by the sword of their brother Jehoram (2 Chron. xxi. 4). Then Jehoram's own sons were slain by the bands of Arabians that invaded the land (2 Chron. xxii. 1). And lastly, Athaliah, upon the death of her son Jehoahaz, exterminated "all the seed royal of the house of Judah" (2 Chron. xxii. 10); this being the third generation that perished in succession. But here, too, as in the others, one and one only was preserved. Joash, the youngest, was rescued from the general massacre by the devotion of his father's sister, Jehoshabeath. And thus the hopes of the house of David hung suspended on the life of an infant of a few months, so completely had this attempt of Satan succeeded.

The Christ, the Promised Seed itself, is the next object of attack, which is emphasized by the several attempts upon the life of Jesus recorded in the Gospel narrative. By Herod (Matt. ii.), at Nazareth (Luke iv. 29); in the temple, twice (Jno. ix. 59; x. 31); and,

* *Generations*, plural; a different meaning from "righteous in this generation" (Gen. vii. 1, singular), where the expression refers to Noah's character among his contemporaries.

finally, by the Evil One in person, in Gethsemane (Luke xxii. 39-46), when he sought to take prematurely that life of which the Redeemer expressly declared "No one taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself" (Jno. x. 18, R.V.); and to which I conceive the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews refers when he makes mention of the Divine Saviour's "supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard" (Heb. v. 7).

And now we arrive at the last recorded assault of Satan—that, namely, upon the seed of the woman during the rule of the Beast and the False Prophet as predicted in the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of Revelation. These chapters will form the subject of our study in the following pages.

Whatever scheme of prophetic interpretation be adopted by students of this sublime Book, there can be no dispute as to three facts stated as matters of prophetic history in this twelfth chapter.

(1.) We have an expulsion of Satan from heaven declared, "The Dragon warred and his angels; and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the old Serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world: he was cast down to the earth, and his angels were cast down with him" (Rev. xii. 7-9).

(2.) A second fact appears from this passage just cited, as well as from the utterance of the "loud voice in heaven" which follows. The sphere of Satan's activity henceforth is confined to earth until his incarceration in the abyss (Rev. xx. 2, 3). "Woe for the earth and for the sea: because the devil is gone down unto you" (xii. 12, R.V.).

(3.) And, lastly, this entrance of Satan to earth is stated to be marked by a fresh accession of wrath against mankind. "The devil is gone down unto you having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time. And when the dragon saw that he was cast down to the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man child" (Rev. xii. 12, 13).

Now, here are three facts. Believers, indeed, may and do differ as to the *time* or *manner* of their accomplishment. Some may and do hold that they have taken place already. Others, on the contrary, say No; the war in heaven is yet to be fought, the diabolical indignation in its last intensity still to be felt on earth. But, whatever may be the differences as to the time or interpretation of the occurrences, we must at least agree that they are recorded there as facts, and facts at some period or other influencing this world's history. This much, at least, is indisputable.

But the disciple of Jesus cannot rest satisfied with he mere knowledge of facts without inquiring how hese bear upon the work and kingdom of the Lord. His own peace, his loyalty to his King compel him to interrogate the Divine Word as to the significance of such events. How must I regard them? Are they events of the past? Or do they portend evil yet to come? This is his first question. And the reply which comes to this from the inspired Word is one which compels me to regard each and all of these events as awaiting a future accomplishment.

For when I turn back to that description of the believers' conflict given by St. Paul, I read this injunction: "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil" (Eph. vi. 11). And then follows the reason: "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (iv. 12). Now, if these words mean anything it is this: The real foes of the Christian—those with whom his lifelong conflict lies—are spiritual Intelligences. Not the temptations, hindrances, infirmities, which affect the spiritual side of man's being, but personal existences, wicked spirits, evil angels, above and outside the man himself, who take advantage of or even occasion these several infirmities in order to his destruction. And these Intelligences are still further described as consisting of divers ranks and orders; *principalities, powers, world-rulers of this darkness—i.e.*, according to Bishop Ellicott,* "those who extend their world-wide sway over the present spiritual and moral darkness"—*spiritual hosts of wickedness*—denoting "the bands, hosts, or confraternities of evil spirits." Once more, we are here informed that the abode or haunt of these wicked spirits is "in the heavenly places" (ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις), the very same word used by St. Paul in this Epistle to denote the place or locality where Christ is set at the right hand of God (Eph. i. 20).

So that, if there were no other word to guide us save this, it alone ought to be proof enough that our Lord's words, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven" (Luke x. 18), pointed to the disciples' miracles as only an earnest at the most of the fall that is yet to be. For if Satan had been then actually cast down, how could the Holy Ghost teach us through St. Paul that "the spiritual hosts of wickedness" still inhabit "the heavenly places"? And, therefore, without any warrant in Holy Scripture to the contrary, we are forced to hold that our spiritual foes are still above us. The Church's vigil in respect of them is still the same, and must so continue until the glorious Parousia of her Redeemer removes her from the battlefield below to the rest that remaineth for her above. Till that blessed moment the enemies of her peace are permitted still to occupy their vantage ground on high, against whom and until which time the soldiers of Christ must keep watch and ward each in his appointed station—each armed in the panoply of God.

And, therefore, when we read (Rev. xii.) of a war in heaven, the result of which is that "the devil and his angels" are banished thence and cast down to earth, it seems to follow as the natural, if not the necessary, conclusion that the Church's conflict must have already terminated, and she herself have been translated from earth into the happy presence of her Lord at or before the time of that expulsion. For, as has been well remarked, "If we suppose the Church to be still on earth, when the Devil and his angels are cast out of heaven, it would no longer be true of us that we wrestle with wicked spirits in heavenly places."†

Two considerations from the Apocalyptic visions lend strength to this conclusion.

The song of praise of those that *tabernacle in the heavens* (Rev. xii. 12), which we find in the twelfth chapter, is just such a pæan of victory as we should expect from a risen and victorious Church, translated from the lower scene of pilgrimage, trial, conflict, to the eternal calm of the home beyond. It is not the song of angels, but of men; of men, too, who recognise a *brotherhood* still upon earth, there persecuted

* Commentary on Ephesians, *in loc.*

† W. Kelly, "Lectures on the Book of Revelation," page 213.

by an adversary who till now has been their accuser in heaven.

Again, in chapter xix., the Faithful and True, whose "name is called the Word of God," is beheld as a conqueror issuing from heaven. "And the armies which are in heaven followed Him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and pure" (Rev. xix. 14). The inference is obvious. If these armies be the Church, as their description unquestionably suggests, then she has been without doubt *in heaven* during the Beast's and the False Prophet's reign of terror upon the earth. And if she is now beheld in the train of the conqueror issuing from the heavens, it is equally plain that her rapture thither must have taken place at some antecedent time.

Thus I feel compelled to believe that the war in heaven, the casting down of Satan, the persecution on earth—three presumably admitted facts of prophetic history—are all of them events still future.

We may, therefore, proceed to the inquiry, Who are the several personalities indicated as special objects of the devil's "great wrath"? There is the "*Man Child*, who is to rule all the nations (*τά ἔθνη*, *the Gentiles*) with a rod of iron." Then, the *Woman*, who is represented as giving birth to this child. And, lastly, we have the *rest*, or *remnant*, of this Woman's Seed, "which keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. xii. 5; 1, 2; 17).

(1.) As to the first of these there ought to be no question. "These words"—*who shall rule all the nations with a rod of iron*—writes Dean Alford, "cited verbatim from the LXX. of the Messianic Psalm ii., and preceded by the *ὅς* [who] of personal identification, leave no possibility of doubt who is here intended. The man-child is the Lord Jesus Christ, *and none other*."* There is a manly common-sense about this exposition that commends it to the sober judgment of the Christian. And there is, too, an honest fidelity to the Word of God, a refusal to surrender its plain natural meaning just because, forsooth, that meaning does not fit in with our own system.

And this plain, intelligible sense is amply borne out by the further teachings of the Apocalypse. Thus the Dragon's attitude—he "stood before the woman which was about to be delivered, that when she was delivered he might devour her child" (Rev. xii. 4)—corresponds exactly with the Gospel narrative of the persistent efforts of Satan against the life of Christ, from the massacre at Bethlehem to the agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. Again, it is stated, "Her child was caught up to God and to His throne" (Rev. xii. 5). With the history of our Lord's Ascension before us, what need to seek any other reference? What other event in the history of the whole world fulfils it? And yet it has been attempted. Again I quote Dean Alford: "Words can hardly be plainer than these. It surely is but needful to set against them, thus understood, the interpretation which would regard them as fulfilled by the '*mighty issue of the consummated birth of a son of the Church, a baptized emperor, to political supremacy in the Roman empire*,' '*united with the solemn public profession of the divinity of the Son of Man*' (Elliott iii. 24)."† I venture to add, if ever the counsel of God has been darkened by words without knowledge, it is by such wilful and irreverent perversion of plain language as meets us here:—Constantine, the son who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron! Constantine, the son caught up to God and to His throne! Once more, the vision of the nineteenth chapter describes the all-conquering "Word of God" in these same terms: "He shall rule them [the nations] with a rod of iron" (Rev. xix. 15). And thus the Man-Child of the twelfth chapter who was "caught up unto God and unto His throne" is identified beyond doubt with the KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS, who comes from heaven to earth, Who "treadeth the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God" (Rev. xix. 15).

It is only necessary to add, what may indeed be thought obvious, that verses 1 to 5 of chapter xii. are retrospective, presenting us with the Birth and Ascension of our Blessed Lord as events already accomplished.

(2.) In the next place, can we identify the Woman who gives birth to this Man-Child? She cannot certainly be the Church. For everywhere in Holy Scripture the Church is designated the Bride, not the Mother of the Christ.

Besides, this Woman is represented, upon the rapture of her Son from earth, as *fleeing into the wilderness*, where, it would seem, she is lost sight of until the Dragon is expelled from heaven, immediately upon which his advent to earth is signalised by an unprecedented outburst of wrath against her.* If, therefore, the Woman were the Church, the latter's existence for the last nineteen centuries ought to have been passed in silence and obscurity, and not, as she has been, engaged in discharging that vigorous mission of activity and blessing which her Lord committed to her to fulfil on earth.

And again, the real trial and conflict for the Woman begins, not from the time of her Son's rapture to heaven, but from the entrance of the Devil and his angels into this earth immediately after their overthrow in heaven. But this, as I have shown above, is exactly the period when the Church's warfare must necessarily terminate, her conflict being (according to St. Paul, Eph. vi. 12) "against the spiritual hosts of wickedness *in the heavenly places*." The Church, therefore, so far from being in the condition here described of the Woman, hated and persecuted by the Dragon, will be at this very time in the enjoyment of the promised glory above.

(*To be continued.*)

THE Rev. A. G. Lockett, curate of St. Paul's, Dorking, has offered himself as a missionary for the Church Missionary Society. He has been accepted by the committee of the society, and expects to leave England in the autumn.

TO THE DEAF.—A person cured of Deafness and noises in the head of 22 years' standing by a simple remedy, will send a description of it free to any Person who applies to Nicholson, 21, Bedford-Square, London, W.C.

* Alford, Grk. Test. in Apoc. xii. 5.
† Alford, Grk. Test. Apoc. xii. 5.

* The *fleeing* (*ἔφυγεν*) of the Woman upon the rapture of her child (Rev. xii. 6) must be carefully distinguished from her miraculously aided *flight* (*πέτηται*), verse 14, upon the arrival of the Dragon on earth. The words, "where she hath a place prepared of God, that there they may nourish her a thousand two hundred and threescore days" (xii. 6), being evidently anticipatory of her abode in security in the same wilderness when the Satanic crusade against her (xii. 14) shall have begun.

PAMPHLET and Advice FREE

Every man and woman in search of HEALTH should write without delay to **Mr. C. B. HARNESS.** *Consulting Medical Electrician* (President of the British Association of Medical Electricians), for his *New Medical Work*, entitled **"Harness' Guide to Health,"** which will be sent post free to any address on application. The treatise contains full particulars of the treatment of the various ills that flesh is heir to. It also contains a selection from the thousands of testimonials received in favor of **Harness' Electropathic Belt** and other curative appliances. Please mention this paper.

MR. C. B. HARNESS also gives **Advice Free** of charge (personally or by letter) on all matters relating to health and the application of Curative Electricity. Note only address, and write to-day, or call if possible.

52, OXFORD ST. LONDON, W.
(Corner of Rathbone Place.)

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1890.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

AT the present time the minds of many are exercised by the appearance of the New Code, which has just been brought forward by the Government. Ever since the passing of Mr. Forster's Education Act of 1870, it would seem that the various Ministers of education have been intent on trying to bring out the very best machinery for perfecting, as far as possible, the education of the people. Whether they have been wise in their modes of action is quite another thing. At the same time we cannot but admit that this age has seen greater vigour in these matters than has ever been known before. But while we are desirous of seeing the educational system of the country as perfect as possible, and planned so as to show the greatest possible and withal lasting results, there is one aspect of the subject which is very often lost sight of or kept in the background, and that is technical education. During the last session Parliament discussed this matter, and we should now like to see some fruit of their labours, for it is no good talking and legislating on these matters if it is to end here. For many years it has been a reproach to us as a nation that the young have only a theoretical knowledge of various subjects, but absolutely nothing of a practical character, and this is where many foreign nations have had the advantage over us. We remember many years ago hearing an employer of labour, in one of our large manufacturing towns, state, that if a clerk were wanted there would be scores of applicants, but if practical knowledge were a *sine quâ non*, there would hardly be anyone who could take a post. We believe it is the same now as then. The tendency of many of the working classes is to think that when a lad has passed the sixth and seventh standard, he should not go to manual work, but should be something higher in their estimation—a sort of clerk. This would perhaps be obviated to a great extent if technical schools were established, where, in addition to the ordinary curriculum, lads could be trained in some handicraft. And so when the time comes for them to leave school there would not be the aversion to manual work, and the foolish idea that such work is menial and degrading would to a great extent be obliterated.

But the question naturally arises, What about the expense of all these new things. True they may be very good, but who is to bear the extra cost? In cases where School Boards exist, we imagine that if the members of the Board saw the great necessity for such education the wherewithal would soon be found. And we think a great deal of the money which is now spent in salaries for certain officials might be much better spent in providing real technical education for the lads. We may further suggest that a curtailment in the outlay on costly buildings might be effected if there is any danger that other matters of importance are to be neglected. In saying all this we do not advocate penuriousness, but a wise economy which shall bring forth the best results for individuals and the nation at large. Further, in Voluntary Schools, and especially in large towns, we think that an appeal to employers of labour, who, by the way, would reap some of the benefits, would be met with some considerable support; and it is a question which managers and those interested in the welfare of the young can well take in hand. What is wanted is to make the rising generation thoroughly conversant with all the requirements of a thoroughly sound education, and also with some knowledge of tools and appliances, which they may have to use in after life. A little less cramming, and more time spent on other matters, will do a great deal to bring about a more satisfactory state of things than now exists.

The New Code has some remarks on continuation schools and also on night schools. In these continuation schools, technical education may well find a place. And we are not quite sure whether the same remark will not apply with equal force to night schools. In former years night schools were very much in vogue, especially in country places, but with the advance of education these schools seem to be less used than formerly, and yet in many cases they are still a necessity. Boys leave school now at a very early age, when they have passed the fourth and fifth standard, and in the course of very few years lose a great deal of what they have learned. This applies specially to country parishes, and therefore a night school is a powerful engine for good in more ways than one. In many of our large towns, there are educational institutes, which do a great deal for the young men, and we venture to think that they might include a regular system of

technical education in their curriculum and evening classes. Doubtless many lads would be very willing to pay something extra for the advantages they would derive. The subject is one of great interest, and if it does bristle with some difficulties, that is no reason why school managers, members of School Boards, etc., should not boldly tackle it. If they do, then we doubt not that posterity will bless them for their efforts.

PAULINUS OF NOLA.—A STUDY OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

By Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester.

(*Continued from page* 224.)

II.—(*Continued*).

Like all other pious and charitable persons, Paulinus was liable to be imposed upon by clever rogues, who knew how to approach him on his weak side. Once there arrived at Nola an old ship-wrecked sailor, named Valgius, who told a story which resembles in many points the Lay of the Ancient Mariner. He had sailed from Sardinia with a cargo of wheat for Rome. Being caught in a storm off the rocky coast of that island, the sailors went in the boat to throw out anchors, and never returned, leaving the old man on board alone. The ship drifted to sea, but the poor old derelict was succoured by heavenly visitors. Felix, with a crew of angels, helped him to cut down the mast, and to pump the water from the hold. And, if ever he was overcome by sleep, Jesus Christ himself pulled him gently by the ear, and opened his eyes, so that he could see the angels that worked the ship for him. Under this august protection the ship drifted within sight of the Port of Rome, of which Valgius discerned the lights ; then floated along the Campanian coast ; then across the Mediterranean to Africa; then back again under the shores of Sicily, and was at last stranded in Lucania. There it fell into the hands of the steward of a property belonging to Postumianus, a senator of Rome, who, more cruel than the waves, seized the ship under his master's manorial rights, and appropriated the cargo, which was still safe on board. The poor old man sought refuge with Felix and Paulinus. He could not have applied to readier or more powerful protectors, for his tale was thoroughly believed, himself baptized with the new name of Victor, and then despatched with a commendatory letter to Macarius, a powerful official at Rome. But before dismissing the old sailor, Paulinus confesses that he had to resist a strong temptation to commit a grievous cruelty. He longed to possess for a relic at least a part of that sacred ear, which the Saviour of mankind had deigned to pull. And here, even in these solemn circumstances, our friend lapses into his wonted jocularity. He could not quite ask Valgius to let him amputate his ear, but he never could keep his hands off it, and was always stroking and caressing it, until he had almost rubbed it all away.

There were other festivities at Nola besides the banqueting of rustics on sacrificial pigs. Paulinus received occasional visits from that high society of Rome, of which he himself had once been an ornament. Most memorable was the occasion, in the year 397, when a crowd of rich and distinguished persons flocked down to Naples to meet Melania returning from the Holy Land. This lady was the most admired of all the numerous female aspirants to the renown of sanctity. She was a Spaniard by birth, related to Paulinus, and claimed descent from several of the highest families of ancient Rome. Having imbibed early in life strict ascetic ideas, and having lost her husband and two of her three children within the space of a single year, she resolved, at the age of twenty, to devote the remainder of her existence to what was then called the service of Christ, a monastic life, spent in visitation of sacred places, and in attendance upon ecclesiastics, especially monks and hermits. She threw her infant son into the arms of Christ, or, in other words, made him a sort of ward in Chancery, entrusting him and his property to the guardianship of the *Prætor Urbanus*, and from that time cared for him no more, and never saw him again for 25 years. This wicked act of maternal desertion was applauded as Christian heroism by the highest spiritual authorities of the time. Notwithstanding it, the boy turned out well, and, strange to say, shared in the general admiration which was felt for his unnatural mother.

Melania had placed herself under the direction of Ruffinus, the fast friend of Jerome's youth, and the bitter enemy of his old age ; had settled with him at Jerusalem, and built convents for men and women, of which he and she were the respective heads, upon the Mount of Olives. Some spiritual caprice, or some vestige of maternal feeling, was at last bringing this lady home to Italy. The sensation at Rome was great. The Appian road groaned and glittered with the gilded carriages, and the silken and embroidered costumes of the rich and noble people, who crowded down, in company with her son, who was now grown up and married, to meet her at Naples, where she was expected to land. From thence the whole cavalcade came up to Nola to pay their respects to Paulinus and Felix. The contrast was wonderful between the fashionables in their splendid equipages and gay clothing, and Melania on a sorry pony, no better than an ass,* with garments of the stuff of which sails and sacks are made, which the fine ladies and gentlemen were always pressing forward to touch, for the sake of the virtue which might be expected to proceed from such saintly raiment. Paulinus received them in what he calls his cottage,† but which he admits to be a spacious building large enough to hold them all. The rank and fashion of Rome were too well-bred to disturb the tranquillity of the place. They listened decorously to the psalms, if they did not join in them, and expressed no discontent at the scanty monastic fare.

Nola was not so given over to asceticism as entirely to proscribe matrimony. Truly, marriage was a much lower estate than celibacy ; but it took place from time to time, and Paulinus was good-natured enough to write epithalamiums for those who committed what he could not but regard as a necessary evil. In spite of all his ascetic notions he heartily enjoyed an event of that kind, just as he delighted to see the poor people devour the steaming pork, which neither agreed with his delicate constitution nor his monastic principles. There was a young couple to be wedded named Julian and Ia (the Greek equivalent of Violet). The bridegroom was a bishop's son, and had already been advanced to the position of a reader. Paulinus infuses

* Viliore asel us burico. † Tugurium.

into his bridal elegiacs all his own sweetness of character, and a good deal of his own sportiveness of mind. The poem quotes all the stock examples, and the familiar advice, "which Holy Scripture doth give, as touching the duty of husbands towards their wives and wives towards their husbands"; and it closes with five punning pentameters, each playing with the name of Memor, the bridegroom's father. In it he satisfies his ascetic conscience by presenting to the new-married couple the alternative, which now lay before them, of living together in virgin wedlock (which was the better course), or else of begetting a family of virgins. Which alternative the young couple chose is unknown. Julian rose to be a bishop, and afterwards (dreadful to relate) became a heretic, and even a heresiarch, who exchanged heavy blows with so formidable a champion of orthodoxy as the great Augustine in defence of what is called Pelagianism. We may be quite sure that his heterodoxy never weakened Paulinus' affection for him. Indeed, some theological experts have said that the language of Paulinus himself lays him open to a charge of at least semi-Pelagianism. We will venture no opinion on that knotty point. But we have pleasure in recording that, alone perhaps of all the writers of his age, he never suffered his sweet character to be soured by theological hatred. Not one unkind word can be found in all his writings for any of the dissidents. Vigilantius, who attacked all the æsthetic practices in which he himself delighted, never ceased to be his friend. Jerome and Ruffinus, the two chief scholars of the age, who hated each other with a rancour in which personal jealousy reinforced religious bitterness, both continued friendly correspondents of the universally-beloved recluse of Nola. He knew and respected Pelagius as well as Augustine, and we may feel quite sure that, if both Julian and Ia fell into heresy, their spiritual father, who married them, never ceased to love them.

(*To be continued.*)

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." May, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

The number opens with a paper by Professor Ryle on The Study of the Old Testament, read before the London Junior Clerical Society, at Sion College, and again by request before the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Chelsea. The tone of the paper is excellent, but beyond that it does not seem to us remarkable.

Archdeacon Farrar's paper on Fasting seems to us exceedingly superficial. His arguments from the language of the prophets, which to any candid reader are only directed against *formal* fasting, are on a level with those which Professor Huxley uses when he "proves" that the same prophets thought the Temple's services needless superstitions. Our Lord's words in St. Matt. vi. are ingeniously explained away. "He might have said in exactly the same way, Whenever ye take the vow of the Nazarite, do it humbly." So Acts xiii. 3, xiv. 15 is accounted for as "natural in a community predominantly Jewish." That is a double-edged argument, and a very dangerous one besides. We are not defending fasting as some do, as though it were a virtue in itself, but we object to such arguments as these, and the present age of unlimited luxury and of excesssive individualism is not a suitable one for decrying a lawful (though, we admit, not essential) form of self-discipline.

We have read with very great interest Dr. Mair's paper on the Testimony of Napoleon I. with regard to Christ. We can recommend our readers, especially those who are much brought in contact with infidelity, to follow our example and make a note of it.

Principal Dykes has a very graphic paper on the Abortive attempt to arrest Jesus (St. John vii.) There may not perhaps be much that will be new to attentive readers of the late Dr. Edersheim's "Life," but the paper is so well written, and brings the scene so vividly before our eyes, that we do not complain of that.

Of Professor Margoliouth's concluding paper on Ecclesiasticus, we can only repeat the remark we made on its predecessor last month.

"An Analysis of the Fifth Book of Hooker, etc., in the form of Question and Answer." By the Rev. George Nelson, LL.D., etc., etc.: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. London, 1890.

This analysis, in catechetical form, does the author, the Rev. Dr. Nelson, very great credit. With great pains and industry he has given us Hooker's very words on every objection which the Puritan, Cartright, brought against our services. At pp. 77, 78, we have it stated plainly that baptism is a means whereby we receive grace. Cartright objects that, if an adult be not a Christian before baptism, he cannot be made one in baptism. The change is not impossible, though not probable. But Cartright forgot that the real difficulty with him and his sect is that regeneration to the sincere adult is the sign of the pardon which, on his conversion, he already had—such was circumcision to Abraham. It must be evident to all that the regeneration then prayed for in behalf of the sincere cannot be conversion, so that it is absurd to confound the two together. When we come to the part about the Lord's Supper any errors are Hooker's and not Dr. Nelson's. Hooker, in saying that the presence is to be sought only in the heart, contradicts the Church Catechism, which says that the bread conveys the grace, pp. 102, 103. Hooker in saying that "no one denied but that the soul of man is the receptacle of Christ's presence," p. 102, overlooked the fact that Rome, by the doctrine of Transubstantiation, makes the stomach the real receptacle of Christ's Body. On this point, then, agreement is impossible, though no doubt Romanists hold with us that there is another kind of presence, that of grace, about which we may all be agreed. It does not appear that Hooker thought of what Ridley said to his judges. I believe that the same body is present which was born of the Virgin and died on Calvary—present, but how? By spirit and grace. This may well be called a real presence of grace, very different from a corporal adorable presence. Hooker, like Homer, might nod but Dr. Nelson has honestly and laboriously given his meaning, and that in a way to be understood even by children.

The Bishop of London has appointed Dr. T. G. Bonney, F.R.S., Hon. Canon of Manchester, to the Boyle lectureship at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION AND DARWINISM.

SIR,—I notice that Mr. Heber Evans writes letters in the PULPIT of the 10th on "Evolution," and on "The Medical Language of St. Luke." On the latter subject I am not competent to offer any opinion, and Mr. Heber Evans is evidently equally incompetent on the former. He says in his postscript, "When your reviewer complacently observes that biologists do not profess to be able to explain the ultimate facts on which their theory rests, one is tempted to ask why the Evolutionists cannot leave us in peace." He must be altogether ignorant of science not to know that no science can explain its own ultimate facts. Gravitation is the ultimate, or fundamental, fact of astronomy, and no one has made the slightest approach to explaining gravitation. Were he writing only thirty years after the publication of Newton's *Principia*, he would probably write: "When astronomers complacently admit that they do not profess to be able to explain the ultimate facts of inertia, initial impulse, and gravitation, on which their theory rests, one is tempted to ask why the Newtonians cannot leave us in peace."

I do not think there is the slightest value to be attached to the opinions of Mr. Thring, Lord Hatherley, and Carlyle on the merits of the theory of evolution. Sir John Herschel was one of the very few men whose opinions are worth having on any question whatever, and I should like to know where and when he called Darwinism the "Law of Higgledy Piggledy." He thoroughly understood the theory of probabilities, not only as a mathematical exercise, but in its application to concrete problems, and was for that reason both likely to see the logical weakness of pure Darwinism, and unlikely to dismiss its claims with a sneer. And, in a letter published as an appendix to Babbage's "Ninth Bridgewater Treatise," he declared his belief that the general doctrine of evolution was true; though he wrote before Darwin's "Origin of Species" had been written, and before the *word* evolution had come into general use.

Finally, Mr. Heber Evans shows his ignorance of the present state of the question by using the words "Evolution," and Darwinism" as synonymous. The doctrine of Evolution is that every living species has become what it is by a process of descent with modification, under natural law, from more simply organised ancestors; but an evolutionist may have any opinion, or none, as to the nature of the agency by which the process of evolutionary modification is effected.

Darwinism is the doctrine that the chief agency of evolution is "natural selection by the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for existence." I am an Evolutionist though not a Darwinian. I believe that the agency assigned by Darwin, though a real and operative one, is altogether insufficient as the sole cause. My reasoning on the subject is to be found, in detail, in my book, "Habit and Intelligence" (second edition, Macmillan, 1879.)

I am not a naturalist, but I have carefully read through Darwin's "Origin of Species" with profound admiration for its extraordinary grasp of facts, and ability and care in research. It is a very mild judgment to say that the man who can call it "nursery babble" proves nothing but his own incompetence. I say this, as I have shown above, without being convinced of the truth of Darwin's main thesis.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, 12th May, 1890.

SIR,—Why is it that when a theory is propounded to account for certain phenomena of life, people who do not take the trouble to investigate the matter at once abuse it and its author?

Mr. Thring "did not care to examine the logical grounds on which biologists gave in their adhesion to the theory of the origin of species," and then called it "nursery babble." (PULPIT, April 26, p. 201.) Carlyle, who does not appear to have been a naturalist in any sense of the word, called it "deluded insanity," etc., etc. The veteran Professor Sedgwick, trained from youth to hale old age in the belief of "Design," could hardly be expected to become an evolutionist in his seventh decade; yet Lyell and Bentham, but little younger than he, leaders in geology and botany, carefully investigated the theory and then—accepted it.

Mr. Evans places the word EVOLUTION above his letter, but uses it as a synonym for "Darwinism." He does not appear to be aware of any distinction between the two words. Many boilogists are thorough evolutionists, but not "Darwinites" in the sense in which some of his followers apply Darwin's theory to-day.

Perhaps it may not be useless to give some few of the grounds upon which the doctrine of evolution (not Darwinism) is based.

When geologists first collected fossils they seemed as distinct from each other as cats and dogs, or bees and wasps are now. The belief of creation with design was universally held, so no one thought of any other process. Hence geology was *tacitly* assumed to corroborate it. This was Professor Sedgwick's position. As fossils multiplied, it was soon found (1) that very distinct species often became linked by a graduated series of intermediate forms; (2) that creatures of different geological horizons, though evidently of the same kind or genus, differed in many ways, and often furnished a graduated series to existing types; (3) that the earlier forms of a series in time were more "generalised," *i.e.*, one animal would embrace the characters which in a later age marked two or more kinds; and (4) that the young stage of the later sorts agreed closely with the adult stage of a kindred form of a previous age. Thus the animal called kuon-arctos, of the Miocene epoch, combined certain characters now separated and belonging to the dog and bear respectively, hence its name. Similarly, in a much older period, the ichthyosaurus united the characters of a fish and of a lizard. The fishes and crustaceans of the very early Devonian period are embryonic in character when compared with existing fishes and lobsters. (5) The series of life taken as a whole exhibit an analogous progress, *e.g.*, at first fishes existed with no amphibia; then amphibia with no reptiles; reptiles with no birds or mammals; mammals with no man.

These are a few only of the lines of evidence afforded by geology. Their significance lies in the fact that they can be illustrated by all classes of fossil animals all over the globe wherever fossils are to be found.

Plants are so perishable that they cannot generally be preserved, but they, nevertheless, furnish analogous evidence to that under No. 5.

With regard to the living world, cultivation shows that plants and animals can vary indefinitely; and to such an extent in many instances has this taken place, that their parentage cannot now be traced, as is the case with wheat and dogs.

Embryology comes in and adds its testimony, for the higher animals pass through stages closely comparable to those characteristic of the lower animals. This runs parallel with No. 4 above. The finely-graduated series which so often exists between existing species and genera, both in animals and plants, correspond with what every geologist is familiar in extinct animals.

Rudimentary organs supply another class of evidence, so that the argument is *accumulative* till it may be thus stated :—That animals and plants are derived by descent, with modification, is an infinitely more probable theory than that every minute difference between species has had a special creative act. Such is evolution. If any one wishes to be a "Darwinite," all he has to do is to add the belief that animals and plants have been evolved by the agency of "natural selection." He may, however, be a thorough evolutionist without accepting Mr. Darwin's addition.

Mr. Evans quotes with approval the charge that "Darwin's influence has been more hostile to Theism than that of any other writer. He repudiated creation, abjured design, and enthroned unreason as Lord of the Universe. . . . He opened a door to Atheism."

This is what Darwin says ("Origin of Species," p. 421) :—"I see no good reasons why the views given in this volume should shock the religious feelings of any one. . . A celebrated author and divine has written to me that 'he has learnt to see that it is just as noble a conception of the Deity to believe that He created a few original forms as to believe that He required a fresh act of creation to supply the voids caused by the action of His laws.'" Darwin adds (p. 429) :—"There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one ; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity from so simple a beginning, endless forms, most beautiful and most wonderful, have been and are being evolved."

GEORGE HENSLOW.

JUDGE WARREN'S PAMPHLET.

SIR,—I see that your correspondent "B." attacks both the Judge's pamphlet and the review of it in your columns. I leave the Judge to speak for himself. He neither needs nor desires my defence.

As to the comma before or after "given unto us," in the second answer on the Sacraments, the three words "given unto us" might be left out, and the sense would still be the same. "The outward visible sign is ordained, by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the grace and a pledge, etc." So "given unto us" may go with sign, and our ground remains the same. Though the Judge does not say that regeneration is conversion, he does say that it is "the death unto sin and the new birth unto righteousness," by which, on his theory, he must mean conversion.—*Q.E.D.*

The Gorham decision went on the ground that Secker and such like divines spake of conversion as regeneration, so they ruled that this conversion, made the misnomer of regeneration, may take place before, in, or after baptism. This is true as to conversion, but false as to regeneration in our services, which means God's public adoption of the baptised. The Church allows no other view of the grace of baptism. Dr. Gorham said afterwards that the Privy Council did not understand his view at all.

"B." has a common place on the word "part." We know that the Catechism does not speak as of two parts of a line, but as of two parts of a man, body and soul. "B." introduces Rome's theory of baptism, and says that if I do not hold that, I am guilty of "complete ignorance," and he charitably imputes THAT to me, rather than Romanism. I thank him for this, but I see what Rome teaches, and prefer the theory of the Prayer-Book, that both infant and sincere adult are pardoned and adopted by the Holy Ghost. Much of what "B." says is very true, and known to every Churchman, and so far I agree with him. What I do not understand, or do not subscribe to, I pass over.

REVIEWER OF THE JUDGES' PAMPHLET.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words in reply to "Presbyter" in this week's number? Whether he is a Presbyter of our Church, or a Presbyterian minister, I cannot decide. I hope the latter, as he treats the Old Testament in a way which is quite incompatible with our subscriptions, unless they are to be regarded as mere barriers against unbelief, which any one who can may vault over.

2. His treatment of the statements as to "Adam's rib" are quite characteristic.

3. As to evil spirits seeking to re-enter into us, who can doubt it, when he sees how they do take possession by their infidel doubts of those who ought to be examples to the flock, men of the highest learning, who would fain startle the simple by their ingenious paradoxes?

4. Our Lord refers to events in the Old Testament as histories. If they are mere fairy tales our Lord was either ignorant, or, knowing them to be myths, He pretended to think them true. Which theory will "Presbyter" adopt?

5. If the Pharisees agreed with our Lord that they were real histories, it is the more likely that both were right. If *they* knew them to be fables, why did they not tell our Lord that they were so? On either alternative it is incredible that our Lord, believing them to be fables, should quote them to his carping enemies as real histories.

C. C., V.-G.

May 7th, 1890.

CORRECTIONS.

SIR,—I shall be glad if you will kindly allow me to say that the quotation from Bishop Westcott, in your last issue, p. 228, should read : "There can be little doubt that Clement occupied a position corresponding to that of St. Peter in the first age. He was the acknowledged mediator between the Judaizing and Gentile believers, and the first legislator of the Christian society." The words following (wrongly included in the quotation) were a question of my own, namely, How could a Gentile have any influence with the

Judaizers? A little further down "another learned Doctor, Lightfoot," should be "another learned Dr. Lightfoot," and proselyte "parentage," should be "proselyte parentage."

In my other letter (on Evolution) in the same PULPIT, the words near the end of the postscript should be "those deep questions;" and lastly, the Ex-President of the British Association referred to is Sir J. W. Dawson.

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 10th, 1890.

"IN PERILS OF WATERS."

O Jesu! we pray Thee the travellers to keep
In peril when lying, and fervently crying:
"Save, Lord, or we perish," out on the great deep,
While the waves, mountains high, and as steep, wildly leap.

Thou readest the thoughts of each poor stricken heart;
Thou art there at its prayer, all its burden to bear:
As Thou biddest "Be still," with the peacemaker's art,
The lightning's quick dart and the tempest depart.

"I love Thee, Blessed Saviour," cries the soul that clings to Thee,
"Now from the surging billows, oh, give back my life to me."

Oh, Jesu! we pray that in love Thou would'st check
The swelling so fast of that hurricane blast,
Which on the horizon seemed but a mere speck,
Tho' soon to change many a deck to a wreck.

At each heart-rending cry from the crest of a wave:
"In mercy, Lord, spare," we all join in that prayer.
With Thee to support us life's billows we brave,
Since Thou art Almighty to save from the grave.

"I love thee," saith the Saviour, "and thy life I give to thee,
Now shall thy life be laden with a debt of love to Me."

J. N.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Appleton, Rev. Richard, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Bonney, Dr. T. G., Boyle Lecturer at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall.
Caldicott, Rev. J. W., D.D., Rector of Shipston-on-Stour; Rural Dean of South Kineton.
Darbyshire, Rev. Benjamin Stewart, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Burscoughbridge, Ormskirk.
Du Port, Rev. James Mourant, M.A., Rector of Denver, and Honorary Canon of Norwich Cathedral; Rural Dean for the Eastern Division of the Deanery of Fincham.
Earée, Rev. Robert Briscoe, Rector of Miserden, Cirencester.
Evans, Rev. Arthur C., M.A., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Calypso*.
Fearon, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Great Marlow; Vicar of Blewbury, Didcot.
Fisher, Rev. Matthew Henry, Vicar of St. Stephen's-by-Launceston.
Fitz-Roy, Rev. Lord Charles Edward, M.A., Rector of Euston-with-Barham, Thetford, and Honorary Chaplain to the Queen; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Her Majesty.
Fuller, Rev. Morris, M.A., Rector of Ryburgh; Vicar of Bishop's Tawnton, Barnstaple.
Gibbings, Rev. Richard, D.D., Rector of Llanmerewig, Newtown.
Grey, Hon. and Rev. John, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Gwynne, Rev. C. B., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Matthew's Mission Church, in the parish of St. Mary's, Birkenhead.
Hardy, Rev. A. O., M.A., Vicar of Maker, Plymouth; Rector of Smarden, Kent.
Hort, Rev. F. J. A., D.D., Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Knubley, Rev. Edward Ponsonby, M.A., Rector of Staveley, near Leeds; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cumberland, Mr. H. Jefferson, Springfield, near Whitehaven.
Long, Ven. R., M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
McCormick, Rev. Joseph, D.D., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Kingston-on-Hull; Honorary Chaplain to Her Majesty.
Metcalf, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Vicar of Tipton St. John, Devonshire.
Nation, Rev. C. C., M.A., Rector of Halesowen; Rural Dean of Dudley.
Noott, Rev. Edgar F. C., M.A., Chaplain of Magdalen College, Oxford; Chaplain of Bromley College, Kent.
Owen, Rev. F., M.A., Rector of Miserden; Chaplain at the British Embassy, Berlin.
Parker, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Wykeham, Hants; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Hampshire, Mr. J. Carpenter-Garnier.
Sanderson, Rev. E. M., M.A., Vicar of Weston St. Mary, near Spalding; Vicar of Huyton, near Liverpool.
Thompson, Rev. J. H., M.A., late Head Master of the Devon County School; Rector of Creacombe, Devonshire.
Treffry, Rev. Reginald Heber, M.A., Prebendary of Trehaverock-in-Endellion in Truro Cathedral.
Vinon, Rev. Frederick Augustus H., Licensed to Officiate generally in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Watkins, Ven. H. W., D.D., Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Westcott, Rev. F. B., M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Williams, Rev. H. Percy, M.A., Rector of St. Martin's, Colchester.
Wilson, Rev. Ralph V., Chaplain to the *Iron Duke*.
Woodhouse, Rev. Arthur Powys, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthias's, Sneinton, Nottingham; Vicar of Tuxford, Notts.
Wynter, Rev. Reginald W., M.A., Vicar of Wellingboro ugh.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Collier, Rev. Charles, M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Chilbolton and Honorary Canon of Winchester, at Chilbolton, suddenly, on the 4th inst., aged 71.
Collyer, Rev. Thomas, M.A., for fifty-six years Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bungay, and thirty-nine years Rector of Gislingham, at Gislingham Rectory, Suffolk, on the 2nd inst., in his 91st year.
Davy, Rev. Archibald, M.A., Incumbent of St. Michael's, Wincle, on the 5th inst.
Ferry, Rev. William, A.K.C., late Curate-in-Charge of Brent Pelham, Herts, at Martin, Lincoln, on the 11th inst., aged 76.
Hill, Rev. John Spencer, at 47 Gore-road, Victoria Park, London, E., on the 6th inst., aged 68.
Huntly, Rev. Benj. C., M.A., Head Master of Hutton Grammar-school, Preston, Lancashire, on the 9th inst., aged 47.
Scott, Rev. John, James, M.A., late of Lynton and Barnstaple, at 28 Henrietta-street, Bath, on the 5th inst., aged 83.
Seaman, Rev. John B., M.A., at Wooton Rise, Bournemouth, on the 7th inst., aged 70.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SUPREME MODEL.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday Afternoon, April 20th, 1890.

"That we may grow up unto Him in all things which is the head, even Christ."—Ephesians iv. 15.

HERE is a statement of the object or one of the objects for which the Church of Christ received her spiritual endowments from her ascended Lord. "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." His purpose, the Apostle tells us, was to bring Christians to moral and spiritual perfection—"for the perfecting of the saints"; to advance the work for the sake of which the ministry had been instituted—"for the work of the ministry"; to build up the fabric of the Christian life in the Church and in the soul—"for the edifying of the body of Christ." A time should be looked forward to when in the unity of the faith, and of the full knowledge of Christ, Christians would reach a perfection which is described as "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." That perfection would contrast sharply with the old pagan life which had preceded it, when uncertainty and division had been the order of the day; when they had been as "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine." This new and higher life would be prompted by sincerity, governed by love, and its vital principle would be "to grow up unto Him in all things which is the head, even Christ." So St. Paul wrote thirty years, or more than thirty years, after the Ascension; but the aspiration, the hope, the effort which he thus described would have taken at least some shape in Christian souls at a much earlier time—nay, we may be bold to say, immediately after the great events, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection, even during those forty days which we are now traversing in memory. During those days our Lord was still lingering on the earth, He was seen from time to time by a few or by many of His faithful followers; but the old period of intimate and unbroken companionship which had preceded the Crucifixion had passed away. Memory can sometimes interpret events more accurately than present experience; it sees them in their true proportion, as the traveller sees the higher Alps in their great grandeur, not from the valley at their feet, but from the distant plain. In those forty days the disciples of Christ would have understood the meaning of their Master's life better than when they were with Him day after day in the villages and fields of Galilee, and now that He was preparing for His triumphal departure they would have discerned with increasing clearness, as to-day's Collect says, that He had been given by the Eternal Father not merely to die as a sacrifice for sin, but also to live as an example of godly life, a model of what human life should be. They would have anticipated St. Paul's desire to "grow up unto Him in all things which is the head, even Christ," and the prayer which we have offered to-day, "that we may daily endeavour ourselves to follow the blessed steps of His most holy life."

Now, the most obvious truths are often the most overlooked. They do not provoke opposition and the defence which opposition calls forth, and, as a consequence, they are apt to be less before the minds of men than other truths which are much more disputable. If this were not the case, it would be unnecessary to observe that the first requisite for all good work is a good model. If a model does not exist it must be projected by the artist before he touches his brush or his chisel. He must have clearly placed before his mind's eye, and perhaps outlined in pencil or shaped in clay, the conception to which he hopes to give a lasting embodiment. Not to have a model is to waste time, skill, temper, material in efforts which have no promise of even moderate success, or of anything other or better than pathetic failure and confusion. Even the Almighty Artist, when He made the worlds, beheld the archetypal forms of things to which He was giving existence traced out in His co-equal wisdom, and no human workman, be he on a higher or a lower level in the school of production, can dispense with this first requisite, a model of that which he desires to achieve. When from this it is inferred that the moral or spiritual artist needs a model no less than the architect, or painter, or sculptor, it will perhaps be objected that moral or spiritual success is a matter not of workmanship so much as of growth. Each tree keeps close to the type of its species. The elm as it grows up has no model elm before it, and yet it does not wander away from its type into that of the oak or the beech; it grows and lives and dies an elm, and this not in obedience to any outward model, but by the spontaneous prompting from within and the law of its life. And the Apostle in the very words before us speaks of the Christian life also as a growth, a comparison which at first sight might appear to do away with the need of an external model. No metaphor, my brethren, can be pressed with impunity to warrant any conclusions beyond its immediate purpose, and when St. Paul speaks of the Christian life as a growth he does not forget

that man is much more than a tree, that he is a being with a free, self-determining will. This will of man, both for good and evil, can very largely modify the growth whether of natural character and propensities or of spiritual powers and endowments within him. Undoubtedly the natural character which we inherit from our parents goes for a great deal. Much is said in our day, and with a large measure of substantial truth, about heredity, the transmission of a type of body and mind and character, from father to son, from one to another generation of a race; but this transmission is always subject to modifications on the part of the individual. Each separate will may mould into new varieties the type of life which has come down from the parent stock, and it is the sense of this liability to variation, possibly in a large number of cases for the worse, which makes each nation instinctively fix upon certain men who are held most perfectly to represent all that is best in it as models for the imitation of those who are just entering on their share in its life. Every country in Europe and England, not less than others, has its representative men, its heroes, some of them numbered with the dead, some of them still tarrying among us, though their day of active labour may have passed; and as we direct the attention of boys and of young men to these great Englishmen we say, "There, and there, and there is a model which in your measure, in your circumstances, according to your abilities, you should try to copy. Keep it before you, study the temper and the characteristics which it offers, and you will not disgrace the country which has produced it, the England which is also your own." Indeed, most of us do for ourselves practically feel the need of a model, and the natural thing for a well-disposed boy is to make a model of his father. His father, he assumes, is a sample of what a man should be, a model ready-made and placed by God's providence in his way, so that he should have daily and hourly opportunities of studying it. A generous son will see nothing but what is good in his father, will admit no deficiencies in him that he can possibly help. Some forty years ago some friends were talking in the presence of John Keble, the poet, of the evils which pluralism—the holding by clergymen of more benefices than one at a time—had in bygone generations inflicted on the Church of England. "I don't know," observed Mr. Keble, somewhat briskly; "my father was a pluralist, and he was not a bad sort of person," the fact being that the old clergyman had at one time in his life held two very small benefices at no great distance from each other. Certainly, pluralism of that kind was no great harm.

But what a serious consideration have we here for thoughtful parents—that a bad or even a defective example on their part may do mischief in the exact ratio of the trustfulness and dutifulness of their children! Have we not lately had one terrible example of this brought home in the courts of public justice to every one in the country, showing, on even a tragical scale, that where a home is not ruled by love, where a father's life presents nothing to his children that can win their affections or that can command their respect, deeds are possible which make ordinary murder seem by comparison tame and almost venial, deeds which even the heathen world would brand as the worst—since parricide most violently outrages the better feelings of unassisted human nature—that it is within the compass of human opportunity to achieve. There is, indeed, a profound law of our human nature which alone explains the immense importance of a pattern or model in life. Whether we will or not, we men do become like that which we admire. If our heroes should be men of ability, but not men of principle; more intent upon personal credit or success than upon the public advantage; more anxious to outwit opposition than to secure the triumph of what is right and true, we should insensibly but surely become like them too; and if they are men whose first idea is to promote, so far as they can, the reign of righteousness in themselves and among other men, amid whatever failures, and with whatever mistakes in detail as to what righteousness may imply or mean, we shall become in our measure, but to our great and lasting gain, like them too. In this matter we may adopt from another and a much more solemn connection those words of the Apostle: "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy, and as the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly."

A model, then, is a necessity in man's moral as well as in his artistic activities, and there are, at least, as many models as there are races of men, nations, callings in life, kinds of occupation. Is there any one model higher than these—supreme, archetypal, a model not for the men of one trade or art, but for the men of all, not for one age or country or race, but for all; a model not only for Englishmen or Frenchmen, for Europeans or Asiatics, for the men of the old or of the modern world, but for all; a model for man as man, in gazing on whom, in admiring whom, in striving to imitate whom, man makes the very best he can of his manhood, gives scope and play to all in it that is highest and noblest, and carries it forward to those heights of excellence at which its real place in the universe, moral as well as material, is most clearly discerned? Yes, the Apostle says there is such a model—Jesus Christ, our Lord. He is the ideal man. His excellence is dwarfed by none of the limitations which make all other models less than universal in their value. Although a Jew, He belongs plainly to all the races of the world; although a peasant, He offers that which the greatest monarchs may do well to imitate;

although untrained in school or university, His majestic intelligence dwarfs down the wisdom of other men to the relative rank of crude guesses or a scarcely disguised nonsense; although living on the world eighteen centuries ago, He is not less a model for the men of our day than for the men of His own. No one type of character or temperament has an unbalanced ascendency in that supreme humanity, because all are represented, and all are kept in their due place. With our finite capacities we can, at the outside, only imitate Him piecemeal, and from generation to generation His servants have fixed one on this and another on that feature of His human excellence in the process of doing so. "I," exclaims one, "will copy His humility"; and another, "I His charity"; and another, "I His patience"; and another, "I His self-denial"; and another, "I His tenderness with those who misunderstand Him"; and another, "I His zeal for the Divine glory"; and another, "I His compassion for the suffering"; and thus the rays of moral beauty which centre in and proceed from the Sun of Righteousness are distributed among His servants in varying measures of excellence, but all of them look up to Him, all know and feel and act upon the truth that He is the one standard of human perfection, all say with one voice, and in never-ending chorus: "Let us if we may, let us if we can, grow up unto Him in all things which is the head, even Christ."

But beyond this there is another level of attainment to which the model offered us in our Lord invites us—I mean the perfect balance which He holds between what may appear to us to be incompatible forms of excellence. Ordinary goodness among men, as we may often observe, constantly means the practice of one virtue at the cost of another. It seems incapable of keeping its eye upon the whole circle of excellencies while endeavouring to excel in one particular. In the supreme type of goodness there is no such one-sidedness or lack of balance as this. In Him no excellence is even stunted down by pressure into imperfect virtue or exaggerated by impulse into something that looks as though it were the confines of vice. Thus in our Lord complete detachment from the ordinary interests and pleasures of the world was combined with an address and manner as far as possible removed from the ostentation of austerity, and His unrivalled dignity of character, based on and inseparable from His inevitable consciousness of greatness, did not check a perfectly simple and lowly bearing with every human being that approached Him. In Him there is no opposition between public duties and private attachments, no such compassion for the sinner as to involve the semblance of indifference to sin, no such strong feelings about men or events as to imperil for a moment His perfect self-possession, no such calmness under opposition as to shade off into moral or intellectual lukewarmness about the truth. Illustrations might be extended, but in those which I suggest there is surely abundant material for our attention and our effort. The Apostle, beyond doubt, has a high ambition when he writes of Christians growing up to Christ in all things; he would have the lofty type of excellence, the great formative principles supplied by his Divine Master's example appropriated by Christians in every department of public and private activity. Politics, literature, art should be Christian no less than domestic life and philanthropy and worship. As the supreme pattern, Christ has something to teach men in every district of human activity and in every sphere of effort; we are to aim at nothing less than growing "up unto Him in all things, which is the Head."

But here a difficulty might be interposed which we cannot put aside without consideration, because of late years it has been insisted on with ever-increasing pertinacity. We are reminded that according to the creed of the Church of Christ, Christ our Lord is much more than man, that He is the "only begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God." How, it was asked, can we imitate such a Being as is here described, even though He is made man and dwells on the earth in human form? We can imitate, it is urged, a perfectly good man who is merely a man; but if Christ is indeed so removed from us as Church Belief implies, imitation seems to be out of the question; the only possible attitude of the human soul towards such a Being must surely be that of wonder and admiration. Undoubtedly, my brethren, the divinity of our Lord is the central truth of the creed of the Christian Church, and before it can be even modified, the whole Gospel of St. John and no inconsiderable portion of the writings of St. Paul must be cut out of the Bible.

But does this faith destroy the value of our Lord's human life as a model for our imitation? Those who say so appear to assume that imitation is only possible when the sphere of life and the range of interest and opportunities are strictly the same in the imitation and the model, and this assumption would disqualify not merely our Lord, but many good men and women from the office of an example to others. For instance, it is a matter of common remark that the Queen sets an example to her subjects of attention to domestic duties, and of care for the suffering and the distressed, which all of us might follow with very great advantage; and considering how far-reaching is the influence of the throne in a society constituted such as ours, it is difficult to over-rate the moral gain to the country of such an example; but supposing a person should object that the Queen lives in so totally different a sphere of life that she has interests, occupations, an outlook so essentially unlike that of her subjects,

that any real imitation of her in the particulars specified is out of the question—would not the objection be felt to be irrational? We may indeed be unable to imitate the dealings of the Sovereign with her Ministers, with the foreign powers, with the questions of prerogative and the constitution. These things belong to an office with which she is, and we are not, entrusted; but she is not therefore beyond our imitation in the general principles of her conduct or in the sphere of duties which are common to her and to ourselves; and although the comparison is even infinitely below the purpose with which it is made, although the greatest of earthly monarchs is as nothing, or less than nothing, before the majesty of the King of kings, still the analogy holds good thus far, that the value of an example is not forfeited by the fact that the being who offers it is in certain respects beyond the reach of imitation. Our Lord's true divinity did not interfere with the truth of His manhood or lessen—nay, surely, in some respects it enhanced—the value of the example which He sets us, from those early years of submission in the holy home at Nazareth to that solemn hour on the Cross when He commended His Spirit to the Father. Indeed, we may observe that excellence, like vice, is not a mere attribute of a living being; it is a thing in itself, no matter who offers an example of it. A lie is a lie whether it is uttered by the fallen archangel in Eden or by a child six years old in the nursery; and humility is humility whether it be practised by one of ourselves or by the Son of the Highest. Our Lord's Eternal Person does not make the virtues which are so apparent in His earthly life inimitable by us since they belong to that common nature which is ours by inheritance, and which, in His mighty love and condescension, He took upon Himself. Certainly we cannot heal the sick, or still the tempest or raise the dead; we cannot assume towards our brethren a bearing which implies that in us they will find inexhaustible sources of strength and consolation; we cannot die for the sins of the whole world, and rise again the third day and ascend to heaven; but we can each of us, in His place and sphere—though it be at an infinite distance—grow up towards the love of which these deeds of power and compassion were the magnificent expression; we can share the mind, though we cannot reproduce all the works, of our Divine and glorified Redeemer.

There is then, I submit, no real speculative difficulty which bars imitation of Him; but no doubt there are moral obstacles and motives which are wont to array themselves in intellectual finery, and with which we must grapple if we would not utterly fail. Self-love in all its forms is constantly holding us back from growing up to the standard of our Divine Head, and self-love must be conquered if we would see things as they are, if we would be as He would have us.

In order to be practical let us fix our attention for a few minutes earnestly on one very prominent excellence in our Lord's human example—an excellence about which, happily, there is no room for controversy, and which if difficult of imitation, is yet imitable by and incumbent upon every one of us—I mean His superiority to injuries. Christians often cherish a spirit of retaliation and revenge, but they know that they are wrong in this because both by precept and example Jesus Christ has told them so. When our Lord appeared upon the earth, the right and duty of revenge for injuries was almost universally recognised. A few philosophers timidly hinted that it might be a mistake, but no one had as yet taught men to realise their true greatness by showing kindness and attention to opponents and persecutors, in imitation of the disinterested providence of the Father in heaven. Our Lord's precept was, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." And why? "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven, for He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." And what He taught He practised, especially during His passion, when no wrongs, no insults could provoke Him to any act or word that was inconsistent with His universal charity, or that could check or even chill the prayer, "Father, forgive them." As St. Peter reminds us in the Epistle for to-day, "when He was reviled, He reviled not again, when He suffered He threatened not, but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously."

It has been thought that a special danger to Christians attaches to neglect of any human excellence that was especially conspicuous in our Lord's earthly life, and certainly the history of the Early Church offers at least one illustration of how much may depend upon the growing up to Jesus Christ in matters where there is no doubt whatever about the force of His example or about the possibility of imitating it. Some of you, probably, know something of the well-authenticated history of Sulpicius. After the issue of his second edict against the Christians by the Emperor Valerian, in the year of our Lord 258, Sulpicius, a presbyter of Antioch of high authority, was arrested and brought in the course of justice before the imperial legate. The usual questions were asked and answered: "What is thy name"? "Sulpicius." "Of what family art thou"? "I am a Christian." "Art thou a priest or a layman"? "I am of the order of presbyters." "Very well; know then our august lords, the Emperors Valerian and Gallienus, have ordered that all who call themselves Christians should sacrifice to the immortal gods; if any despise this edict ne is to be tortured and put to a cruel death." "We Christians,' 'replied Sulpicius, "have for our king Christ, who is also God; He is the true God,

Creator of heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is therein: the gods of the nations are evil spirits." Sulpicius was then put to the torture, and when he had endured this with great patience he was taken away to be beheaded. As he was on his way to execution a Christian, called Nicephorus, rushed forward and fell at his feet. Between him and Sulpicius there had been a dispute over some trifle, followed by a coolness of long standing, and Nicephorus felt that he must win, if he could, forgiveness from and reconciliation with Sulpicius while there was time. "Martyr of Christ," he cried, "Martyr of Christ, forgive me, for I have wronged thee." Sulpicius did not reply. A little further on Nicephorus repeated his request. Sulpicius still took no notice of him. The pagans asked Nicephorus what he expected to get from a fool who was on his way to a well-deserved punishment, but Nicephorus renewed his prayer, even when the place of execution had been reached, and still Sulpicius was inexorable; he still maintained that persistent, that significant silence, and then there ensued a scene which struck all the beholders with astonishment, which struck the Christians with awe. It seemed as if Sulpicius, who had not flinched under the torture, was growing paler as he beheld the sword of the executioner. "Kneel down," said the lictors, "kneel down, Sulpicius, that thou mayest be beheaded." "Why should I?" said Sulpicius. "Because," said they, "thou hast refused to sacrifice to the gods; thou hast despised the edict of the august Emperors Valerian and Gallienus." "Do not strike me," cried the unhappy Sulpicius; "I obey the emperors; I will sacrifice." Once more Nicephorus rushed forward, and this time it was to implore Sulpicius not to forfeit the heavenly crown which was already well nigh won by so much previous agony; but it was all in vain. "Then," said Nicephorus, "I will take his place; tell the legate there that I am a Christian," and he was forthwith taken at his word. That history sank deep into the heart of the ancient Church. The fall of Sulpicius was quoted to show that the greatest of all sacrifices which a man can offer—the sacrifice of his life—is not accepted on high when it is offered by those who have not learned from Jesus Christ how to pardon injuries. That attainment to the standard set before us by our Lord in His human life is wholly impossible without aid from God is a truth of which those persons will be most surely convinced who have endeavoured to achieve it. "Without Me you can do nothing," is a word from heaven that is ever sounding in our ears. "Christ *in* you is the hope of glory," not only of heavenly glory after death, but also of the moral and spiritual glory which is possible for Christ's servants here on earth. By His Spirit, by His sacraments, our Lord takes up His abode in the soul and body of a Christian, and makes him what, left to his own natural resources, he never could be. If in the Church of Jesus Christ men have been merely moral, but also holy—not merely courageous, and faithful, and sober, but also humble, and self-sacrificing, and unwordly, this is because a higher force has taken possession of them, and has made them what of themselves they could not be. If you would grow up unto Christ, pray for a larger outpouring in your souls of His Holy Spirit, make frequent and devout use of His holy sacraments, and of other means of grace, and be quite sure that what is impossible for man is possible with God. But as you grow, remember that you are also free agents. Keep your eye fixed on the Great Model. "There is one thing," said John Bowdler, an excellent layman of the Church of England in the last generation, and he said it when he was on his death-bed, "There is one thing that I regret more than anything else in life, and that is that I have not always set before me every morning of my life some one saying or action of our Lord Jesus Christ for my guidance and imitation throughout the day."

Certain it is that as time passes, whether we will or not, we are growing in some sense, growing up to something. Neither the soul not the body of man is ever stationary. They say that within seven years the whole substance of man's body changes by the mere processes of exhaustion and nutrition, and who that watches what goes on in that more important part of his being, the soul, can be insensible to the changes, many and profound, that must surely come with the lapse of time? Neither feeling nor thought are ever stationary. Growth and decay are always in progress; but the vital question is, What it is that is decaying and what it is that grows? Is it what the Apostle calls epigramatically "the old man" that is decaying, or is it the new"? Is it the "new man created in Christ Jesus, in righteousness and true holiness," who is growing, or is it the "old"? A vital question most assuredly for all of us, especially as life draws towards its close, and the day approaches when the result of all such growth and change will become fixed and unalterable.

Surely the time is short,
Endless the task and art
To brighten for ethereal Court
A soiled earth-drudging heart.
But the dread proclaimer of that hour
Is pledged to thee in love as to thy foes in power.

IT is stated that the Bishop of London has vetoed the new proceedings taken in connection with the St. Paul reredos.

THE *Record* understands that the Rev. H. P. Napier, M.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, and of Ridley Hall, has been chosen to succeed the late Rev. E. J. Perry in the principalship of Trinity College, Kandy. "Mr. Napier, who is expected to sail within the next few weeks, has been for several years a master at Monckton Combe School, and is a son of the Rev. J. W. Napier, vicar of Stretton, Staffordshire."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 24, 1890.

GLADSTONE AND DISESTABLISHMENT.

HOW frequently it happens that some external and extrinsic event exercises a profound effect upon a political question. The Clerkenwell explosion, caused by Fenian emissaries in 1867, Mr. Gladstone avowed, had been the means of bringing the Disestablishment of the Irish Church within the range of practical politics. The Phœnix Park murders had a tremendous influence upon Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy in 1882. And recently Mr. Gladstone's vote, given for the first time in favour of the Disestablishment of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, is another of those external events which so often shape permanently the fate of a great public controversy.

Prior to 1843 the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, as by law established, embraced all Scottish Presbyterians. Then came the disruption from within, not on a point of dogma, nor upon the question of Disestablishment. To this day the Scottish Presbyterians agree in believing that the union of the Church and State is desirable. It was upon the alleged usurpation of the civil courts that the split came, and therefore, as Lord Hartington wisely remarked in the debate last Friday three weeks, reform and reconstruction of the whole Scotch Presbyterian Church ought not to be beyond the limits of possibility. To cure internal divisions by the introduction of such drastic medicines as Disestablishment and Disendowment is merely to imitate the quack doctor's plan of proceeding and leads us naturally to inquire the reasons for all this hurry and precipitation.

For ten years Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the Liberal party, has preserved a position of balanced ambiguity on the Scotch Disestablishment question. All the old-standing questions between the Presbyterian bodies were in existence as emphatically at the general election of 1880, in which Mr. Gladstone took so prominent a part, and again in 1885, as they are now, and yet not once in those crises did the Member for Midlothian present the case for Scotch Disestablishment as he did three weeks since. He never for a moment enquired, as he now does, whether the Scotch Establishment occupied a peculiar position as to the care of the poor, as to whether it bore testimony to particular truth, or as to whether it was the Church of the majority. On the contrary, Mr. Gladstone, in 1885, expressly excluded the whole question from the authorised programme. He refused, indeed, to do what he now does—to support an abstract resolution on the subject on the ground that he had no plan, and that public opinion had not advanced sufficiently to make him even take the responsibility of drafting a plan.

Now why did Mr. Gladstone adopt this attitude in 1885? Simply and solely because British Churchmen took serious alarm at the idea that Disestablishment was going to be introduced as a plank in the Liberal platform. A number of Liberal candidates had taken up Disestablishment in English constituencies as a cry, and there was already a revolt amongst Liberal Churchmen. So great was the alarm that Mr. Gladstone was forced to go down to Edinburgh and explain categorically that there was no reason for the supporters of the Church to feel apprehension on account of the supporters of Disestablishment getting into Parliament, because it was part of the contract that the question should not come on in that Parliament. The Old Parliamentary hand saw that to precipitate the question of Disestablishment in England would be to relegate him to the cold shade of Opposition, so he promptly took steps to draw the teeth of the threatened antagonism.

Then came the Home Rule fiasco of 1886. The same motion for Scotch Disestablishment was brought forward in March of that year. It was rejected by a much less Conservative Parliament than the present by a majority of 112. This was principally owing to the attitude of Mr. Gladstone himself, who while not voting against spoke in disapproval of the motion as premature and inopportune. It is one of Mr. Gladstone's characteristics to hate inopportune motions. What he desires is to see a question ripened by others, and then to pluck the fruit, and take the credit of having grown it. So it was that in 1885 and 1886 Disestablishment was "not good enough" for Mr. Gladstone to touch. Once out of office a change came o'er the spirit of his dream. With Lord Salisbury in power, and with a shattered and divided party at his back, the chief of the Separatists felt it incumbent to seize any weapon that presented itself. And so at Nottingham, though he refused to be

"trapped" into defining Home Rule, he announced with great emphasis that the question of Scotch Disestablishment was ripe for solution. There was a *quid pro quo*, of course. The Scotch must go solid for Home Rule. On that condition the great man would swallow the pill, and strike one more blow at the Government in power. In 1888 the motion again came on in the House. Mr. Gladstone neither spoke nor voted. There had not been sufficient time for the fulfilment of the conditions, and perhaps it was best to say nothing. Now at last the time seems propitious. The seat on the fence is deserted. Radicals are mutinous, and generally the horizon is dark. In the secrecy of his closet Mr. Gladstone has drafted his plan, and declares boldly that Scotch Disestablishment is a foregone conclusion, and that it will not require two hours' discussion before it is placed on the statute book directly he is returned to power.

As we said at the outset, this new departure of Mr. Gladstone, on a question external to Home Rule, may have an important bearing upon the Home Rule question itself. If Liberal Churchmen were indignant and fearful in 1885 upon the Disestablishment question, they will be doubly so now with the added experience of Mr. Gladstone's marvellous adaptability of opinion to vote-catching necessities. Scotland may be "wobbling" on Home Rule. If so, throw her Disestablishment. So the Opposition leader may argue. But the same policy applied to England, or even the bare possibility of it, will open the eyes of Churchmen to the true intention of the last and most lamentable tergiversation of the Old Liberal chief. The move is significant, but rather as indicating weakness in the ranks and policy of the Opposition. Such unworthy tactics could hardly be necessary, unless Mr. Gladstone felt his own position very insecure. Nor are they without danger to his own party, nay, even to his own seat in Midlothian, which is well known to be a stronghold of the Established Church of Scotland. In any event, the new departure deserves chronicling as marking a fresh epoch in the history of the present Parliament, and of the opposing parties therein, and ought to be regarded as a warning to Churchmen in England and Scotland to make ready for the battle thus wantonly forced upon them.

WE are glad to be able, on the authority of the *Church Review*, to modify the "exaggerated" reports which have been circulated as to the health of the Rev. L. S. Wainwright, vicar of St. Peter's, London Docks. "He is so far convalescent, indeed, that he was able to leave the clergy-house on the 14th inst. for the first time. His first journey was to St. Agatha's schools, immediately behind his beloved church (through which he walked), and the pleasant surprise that his unannounced visit gave to both scholars and teachers may be better imagined than described.

PAULINUS OF NOLA.—A STUDY OF THE FOURTH CENTURY.

BY REV. W. E. RAWSTORNE, M.A., HON. CANON OF MANCHESTER.

(*Continued from page* 237.)

II.—(*Continued*).

IT was amidst occupations like these that the first seventeen years of his life at Nola were passed. The feeling occurred to him from time to time that this mode of life was only an elevated and refined form of self-indulgence. He and his Therasia had indeed given up all their goods to glorify Felix and to feed the poor; and they lived on the plainest food, sparing all that they possibly could from themselves. But were not the halls of the saint their home and their palace, of which, by the kindness of their benevolent landlord, they were undisputed masters? And had not they the full enjoyment of the decorated walls and gilded ceilings and picturesque ceremonial? And was not much of the veneration of the people paid personally to them? Unconsciously they had chosen the only happy mode of life that could be found in that terrible age, in which the whole Roman world was crumbling into ruin. They had no family to fear for, and so they cast cares and anxieties away, and trusted that Peter and Paul would have influence enough in heaven to defend Rome, and Felix Nola, from the barbarians. When the invasion of Rhadagast was defeated in A.D. 405, this confidence in patron saints rose to the height of triumphant certainty. The martyrs and confessors, to whom, and not to Stilicho, the successful defence of the empire was attributed, had clearly proved themselves to be a better protection than the legions.

The Natal Poem of A.D. 406 possesses a pathetic interest. It is the last complete one remaining, and it gives a view of Nola and Paulinus in their last period of untroubled happiness. There assembled to celebrate the Festival of Felix (January 14th) a little company of nine. All belonged to the high aristocracy of Rome, and were friends and relations of each other. Turcius Apronianus, a man of middle age, a senator of Rome, and a recent triumph of the cross, was there with his wife Avita, sister of Melania, and his two children, Asterius and Eunomia. He had been lately converted under the influence of his sister-in-law; he and his boy had been baptized together, and his daughter, who was old enough to take a leading part in Paulinus' choir, had been devoted from her earliest years to a virgin life. There was also a young married couple, Pinianus and Melania the younger, granddaughter of the elder lady of that name, whose history is a perfect idyll of ascetic life. The pair were cousins, of high degree, each tracing their descent to Valerius Publicola, the third consul of Rome. The marriage had been made up by the families, and had been completed when the bridegroom and the bride were only seventeen and thirteen years old. It had taken place about thirteen years ago. During all this time the cruel old fanatic, the bride's grandmother, had been trying to separate them for the good of their souls; and it was supposed that this benevolent motive was the chief cause of her return from the Holy Land. But they loved and clung to one another; and, though they let themselves be persuaded to discontinue conjugal relations, they altogether declined to live apart.

There came with them the wife's mother, Albina ; but, happily for the enjoyment of the company, the saintly grandmother remained at Rome. These seven, with the host and hostess, made up the party of nine. Paulinus, secure and jubilant under the protection of his celestial patrons, is in his most gushing mood. Heroic verses, elegiacs, iambics succeed one another to the extent of more than eight hundred lines. He recounts the happy experiences of his past life, all of which he attributes to the influence of his dear patron, and he looks forward confidently to a continuance of his present happiness. He and his guests thoroughly enjoyed their day. Light-hearted Christian epicureans, they lived for the moment, and left the future to God and the saints.

It was on people thus minded that the terrible blow at last descended. In all the intervening years (407-409) the storm was gathering and approaching. Alaric spared Rome once on payment of an enormous ransom, but on the 24th August, 410, he entered the Eternal City, and delivered it to the brutal passions of his barbarians. Many of the wealthier Christians deserted the city before its fall, carrying with them all that was movable of their vast possessions. Amongst these was the holy Melania, and all the party who had visited Nola four years before. But all that remained of that elegant society, with which Paulinus and Therasia were connected by so many ties of blood and friendship, endured the extreme calamities of savage warfare. Men were massacred, women outraged, splendid mansions plundered and burnt, and multitudes of the young and noble, who had known nothing hitherto but the profusest luxury, were carried into captivity as slaves to barbarian masters. The fall of Nola followed soon after that of Rome. Felix was supposed to have appeared to some of his citizens, but he could no more protect them than Bel and Nebo could deliver Babylon. In the midst of this catastrophe, Paulinus and Therasia held their ground. They fell into the hands of Alaric, who threatened them with torture, to induce them to give up concealed riches ; but they could appeal to God, who knew where all their wealth was gone, and they were not subjected to any extreme of cruelty.

Here, unfortunately, this graphic self-portraiture ends. There are no more natal poems, though our saint lived for twenty-one years more, during the greater part of which he was bishop. We ask in vain whether he had the heart to write any more encomiums on his patrons, after Peter and Paul had failed the Romans, and his own Felix, Nola, in the hour of their greatest need. The remainder of his life is an almost perfect blank. But there is an account of his death which is evidently the work of a contemporary and eye-witness.

The surroundings of his death-bed were very melancholy. His Therasia was no longer with him ; it is unknown when she died. She had been to him the submissive wife whom he had prayed for in youth, yielding to all his wishes, and taking part in all his pursuits ; and, it is to be feared, a rather negative character, for, though he associates her with himself in the humble title which he prefixes to many of his letters (*Paulinus et Therasia peccatores*), yet, in all those garrulous * epistles, he never relates a personal action or speech of hers. Whichever way his eye turned he could see nothing but destruction and misery. Italy, it is true, had revived a little, since the death of Alaric. But his native Aquitaine had been overrun and subjugated by the Goths, and so had Therasia's Spain. Africa was being devastated by the Vandals at that very time. Augustine had died less than a year before in his beleaguered episcopal city. Jerome and the devout ladies who attended him at Bethlehem were all gone. Sulpicius Severus, his bosom friend and fellow æsthetic, was dead. Of the whole circle of friends with whom he had held such sweet converse, few were alive, and none were near him. He himself in the exhaustion of old age was left to the care of younger disciples, who revered him as a saint, but could not have loved him like those who had passed away. He was in such real poverty, that a casual gift of twenty solidi seemed to him a god-send, intended to enable him to pay the tradesmen's bills who had supplied him with clothing for the poor. We are surprised to find him in his last extremity, applying, not to the saints, but to the chief physicians,* for whose art he had in earlier days expressed great contempt.† Truly the doctors had their revenge. For severe pains in the side, they burnt him with hot irons, which caused him the sufferings of a martyr, without the glory, and exhausted his little remaining strength. Better for him had he continued to trust in Saint Felix, or Saint Esculapius, or any other personification of the healing power of Sancta Natura. Two saints visited him in his dying dreams, but neither of these was Felix. One was Januarius, whose blood is still being liquefied at Naples, an ambiguous saint of uncertain period, and without a biography, and Martin of Tours, his own contemporary and countryman, and the peculiar idol of his dear friend Sulpicius Severus. The last name upon his lips was Christ.‡

III.

THE chief importance of his writings is the picture which they present to us of the blending of Paganism with Christianity, at the very period when that intermixture took place. They show us clearly that polytheism entered along with the Pagan nations immediately, and almost in one mass. The martyrs and confessors stepped at once into the places of the second and lower ranks of the heathen gods and goddesses. The names were changed, and the morality elevated, but the polytheism and idolatry remained. Yet it s remarkable that the particular worship, which seems most obvious, and *à priori*, likely to be developed the earliest, was not the first to enter. One so sentimental and feminine as Paulinus might have been expected to feel a special devotion for the Virgin Mary. But he hardly mentions her name. Nor does he worship the elements of the communion, though the word *Hostia* had already been coined and applied. His own peculiar fetish was a martyr's bones.

Most of the external practices of Paganism were continued. Votive animals were still brought and

* Ecce iterum garrio. His garrulity, which he is always apologising for, and always committing again on the next occasion, is the charm of his letters, and the fault of his poems.

* Archiatri.

† He puts the following words in the mouth of one of his characters :—

Non pretium statui medico, aut fastidia lecti
Tristia sustinui, neque per scalpella, vel ignes,
Aut male mordaces vario de gramine succos,
Sævior et morbis et vulneribus medicina
In corpus grassata meum est.

‡ Paravi lucernam Christo meo.—Psalm cxxxii. 17.

slaughtered at the temples. Augustine protests against these offerings being considered divine services (*sacra*), or sacrifices (*sacrificia*), and will only call them ornaments to the memory of the martyrs. The rude peasants could appreciate no such fine distinctions; to them they were, afterwards as before, bribes to a supernatural power, from which they feared injuries, or hoped for benefits. The heathen sacrifice had been followed by a banquet, which was a scene of profuse feasting and jollity. These feasts still continued, and were given by wealthy Christians on a gigantic scale. Pammachius, son-in-law of Paula, Jerome's pupil and patroness, celebrated his wife's funeral by a feast given to all the poor of Rome, whom he assembled in the basilica of St. Peter, where they filled not only the church itself, but the vestibule, the colonnades, and the court-yard. All these were amply fed, and dismissed each with a basket full of provisions. Paulinus thinks that St. Peter must have been pleasantly reminded of those old times, when he too had carried a basket, and gathered up the fragments of a feast. The Christian teachers made great efforts to give these banquets a charitable object, in which they succeeded, and also to keep the festivities within the bounds of order and morality. But in this latter point they signally failed, old habits being too strong for them; and all night festivities, in which drunkenness and other vices prevailed, revived the tradition of Bacchus and Venus, even in the precincts of the martyrs.

The Christian calendar was gradually filling itself with festival days in substitution for those of heathenism. The Church had brought Pasch and Pentecost with it, as birth-marks, out of the womb of its Hebrew mother. Epiphany had soon been added by Oriental Christians as the first feast of the Nativity, and its observation had spread westward, long before the Fourth Century. The days of the Crucifixion and Ascension had been already placed in the calendar at their proper intervals from that of the Resurrection; and a forty days' fast before the Paschal festival was already an established observance. Our present Christmas, the Pagan festival of the new-born sun, had been recently baptised and consecrated as the birthday of Christ.* Besides these, there were a number of natal days of saints, which were gradually extruding from the calendar the earlier *Natales* of the deified emperors.

Paulinus has been credited with the first introduction of bells into churches. We wish the bright idea had occurred to him; he would so thoroughly have enjoyed them, and described them in endless hexameters; but he does not mention them. He was one of the first to introduce pictures into churches. Till some time after the beginning of the fourth century these had been rigidly excluded in view of the peril of idolatry. But he adorned his porticos with both frescos and mosaics representing scenes from the Old and New Testament, and the apses of his churches with symbolical paintings of the Trinity, the Apostles, and the Evangelists. There must have been, in the New Testament scenes, attempts at the portraiture of Christ, but in the apses there were only symbols. And, though there were crosses in gold and jewels, there was no crucifix. He admits that pictures were an innovation,* but defends them on the grounds of the instruction which they convey to the illiterate, of the humanising influence of art, and of the employment which they gave to the rude masses who assembled at festivals; who, if they were induced to spend some time in the picture gallery, would have fewer hours left for sensual excess. The sculptured image was still the exclusive property of the Pagans.

Those practices of ceremonial and decoration, which, in the present decrepitude of English Christianity, have become the leading religious questions of the day, were, in Paulinus's time, at different stages of progress. The ceremonial use of lights, which had been ridiculed as an absurd Pagan practice by Tertullian (A.D. 200), and by Lactantius (A.D. 300), and condemned by a provincial council (A.D. 305), had become an established Christian practice before the close of the fourth century. Incense was yet unknown in Christian Churches. Nor do we find in Paulinus's writings any allusion to Eucharistic vestments, or any other peculiar dress of the officiating clergy. The vestry of the flamens had not yet been ransacked for costumes. But nearly all the Pagan priestly titles—*sacerdos*, *antistes*, *pontifex*—had already been assumed—all, in fact, except *flamen*, though Paulinus's most appropriate title would certainly have been *Flamen Felicialis*.

We cannot part with him without regret; a sweeter, gentler being never lived. We think that we have met, in actual life, men somewhat resembling him, with the same affectionate disposition, the same innocent gaiety and sportiveness, the same devout spirit, the same delight in ecclesiastical ceremonial, and withal the same credulity, and the same imperfect appreciation of the duty of exact veracity. Not that he ever told a conscious untruth. His most incredible tales are related on the authority of other witnesses, whose accounts he never thought of doubting or testing; and, in the case of wonders which he himself has seen, he merely permits his poetic imagination to paint and amplify, until a very ordinary occurrence has grown under his hands into a miracle. His loving disposition was the chief cause of all his superstitions and idolatries. Though his Felix was almost entirely the creature of his imagination, yet his affection for him was real and sincere, and its very fervency caused him to exaggerate.

It would sometimes seem as if the softer, gentler graces of Christianity—trust, reverence, devotion, fervour, affection for supernatural beings, vivid realisation of a super-sensual world—were incompatible with a calm, scrupulous, jealous adherence to reality and truth; and as if a tender and loving devotee must necessarily be superstitious and idolatrous, as our Paulinus certainly was.

This often is, but this need not be. If the central truth of each of our minds be that one, which Jesus of Nazareth made the centre of His religion, that the nearest to us of all the beings of the higher world is

* The origin of the Christmas festival is very clearly shown in two ancient calendars, printed side by side by the Bollandists (Acta Sanctorum Jun. Tom. vi. suppl., page 834). The older one is for the year 354 A.D., and is entirely Pagan. The latter one is for 448 A.D., and is Christian, but with many Pagan survivals still unremoved. The entries for December 25th are as follows:

I. (A.D. 354).	II. (A.D. 448.)
viii. Kal. Jan. Natalis Invicti.	Natalis Domini Corporalis. Solstitium.

The 25th of December was celebrated by the Latinised nations as the Solstice, the birthday of the new-born sun, whose distinguishing Mithraic epithet was *Invictus*. The day was in the fourth century transferred by the Occidentals to Christ. The Orientals, whose original Nativity had been the Epiphany, conformed afterwards to the Western usage.

* Novo more.

our Father, who is absolute, all-embracing Love—that (if only a Creator exists) His fatherhood is the most certain of all facts, His love to His children the most natural of all affections, and His duty towards them the most self-evident of all responsibilities, then the other supernatural beings range themselves in their proper places behind Him. He is the link between us and them, not they between us and Him. He is the first object of our loving confidence, and on Him our religious affections first take hold. For He is our Father; and, if He does not love us, who else can? He is, perhaps, surrounded by thousands and millions who are also our friends, and, amongst these, by our own departed; but all these are behind Him, and we cannot reach them except through Him. If we want intercourse with any Felix, male or female, for whom we may have formed a spiritual attachment, we must know that we can only get at him through our Father.

And if we add to this idea a further one, which is also a truth in Jesus, that, since it is not given to man on earth to attain completely to objective truth, our Father's present service is subjective truthfulness—scrupulous veracity in thought, and word, and deed, we should, as a filial duty to Him, carefully examine every phenomenon, and test every supposed manifestation of Him, without prejudice and without fear, and thus escape those superstitions and idolatries, which were the amiable weaknesses of our dear Nolan friend.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—The proper lesson of this morning's service contains a denunciation of Israel, in case that he should be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them. I desire to ask, does this warning imply that the other gods spoken of have a real existence? For if the reasoning (if it be a reasoning) in "C. C., V.-G.'s" letters on our Saviour's Old Testament references be sound, then by parity of reason, the references in the Old Testament to *other gods*, involve of necessity that those other gods actually exist, or existed when reference was made to them. "C. C., V.-G." says that our Lord refers to events in the Old Testament as histories; meaning the allusion to Jonah in Matt. xii. 40. How does your correspondent know that our Lord so referred to Jonah? It should be plain to any one, that a reference in conversation to a matter with which the audience are acquainted does not by any necessity imply a corroboration of the views of the audience concerning the particulars of the matter. Our Lord most certainly had a thorough spiritual understanding of the Scriptures. If it be the case that the swallowing and vomiting up of Jonah by the whale is a parable, that does not prevent it from being a proper illustration of our Saviour's death and resurrection. On the contrary, if it be a parable, and if it shows forth the captivity and restoration of the Jews, as many excellent commentators believe, it becomes a more forcible illustration and analogy than under any other supposition. Our Lord constantly employed parables. Did the conversation between Abraham and the rich man across the great gulf really occur? On "C. C., V.-G.'s" assumption of the meaning of our Lord's references, it must have really occurred. Your correspondent speaks of fables. A fable may be a parable, and a parable may be a fable; but all fables are not parables, nor are all parables fables. The use of the word in the letter is nothing but loose language.

The rest of the letter in to-day's PULPIT is something more than mere unreason. There is a most unworthy sneer at your excellent correspondent "Presbyter," who is evidently alluded to as entertaining infidel doubts; and there is an accusation against him of treating the Bible in defiance of regard to subscription of our Articles. Now our Articles lay down no canon of Scripture criticism; and those who understand the Scriptures differently from "C. C., V.-G."—and I must say, who appear to me to understand them with far more both of intelligence and reverence—are not on that account either infidels or unfaithful to their subscriptions. If it be difficult for "C. C., V.-G" to perceive his own deficiency in reverence, let me point out that he seems rather to entertain belief of his own notions about the Bible than of the Bible itself.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

Sunday after Ascension, 1890.

SIR,—With the Bishop Gray, of Capetown, your weekly correspondent decides that "imputing to our blessed Lord ignorance and the possibility of error is a most subtle heresy, destructive of the reality of the Incarnation, is a departure from the Catholic faith, as held by the Church from the beginning, and expressed in the second article and the creeds."

"Presbyter" errs with *Jeremy Taylor*. *Athanasius* said "as, on becoming man, He hungers and thirsts and suffers with men, so with men, as man, *He knows not*.

To *Cyril* it was evidence of His love that He could bring Himself down to so great humiliation as to bear all things that are ours, one of which also is *ignorance*. Chrysostom and Augustine are not less explicit. See Mr. Houghton's letter in the preface to the third part of Dr. Colenso's book on the Pentateuch.

The Gospel narrative asserts that Jesus grew in wisdom.

Orthodox champions are very fond of the term "incredible." At every turn we are told that the truths of God are "incredible," unless this or that argument is valid, unless this or that evidence makes out exactly what the writer believes it to prove. How dangerous such statements are depends upon who makes them; how full of self-conceit, and how unwarrantable they are is more easily measured.

R. C. FAITHFULL.

Quorn Vicarage, Loughborough.

JUDGE WARREN'S PAMPHLET.

SIR,—The reviewer of the pamphlet of Judge Warren on the baptismal controversy is dissatisfied, because I accuse him of ignorance. I have to add to this accusation another, viz., that he uses bad grammar. I see in his letter to-day, "The Gorham decision went on the ground that Secker and such-like divines spoke of conversion as regeneration, so they ruled that this conversion made the misnomer of regeneration, etc.'

Who ruled so-and-so? If your reviewer means that the Privy Council ruled as he says, I contradict him flatly; the Privy Council did not so rule. If he means that Archbishop Secker and others of his school ruled so-and-so, I contradict him as flatly. Secker's teaching concerning the grace in holy baptism is to be found in his lectures on the Catechism. Those lectures do not teach what your reviewer says they do. If he can produce any other writings of that eminent man, which do teach what he says, let him produce them. The Privy Council's judgment in the Gorham case was not what your reviewer says. That judgment was, that the Bishop of Exeter should institute Mr. Gorham to the benefice to which he (Mr. Gorham) had been presented. It laid down nothing as to the doctrine of the Church, except that Mr. Gorham's doctrine was not contrary to the doctrine of the Church.

The reviewer in his letter of to-day contradicts himself. After telling us that the Gorham judgment was so-and-so (which it was not) he says that "the Church allows no other view of the grace of baptism" than a totally diverse view from that which, according to him, was decided in the Gorham case to be its doctrine. What authority has your reviewer to say that the Church allows this and does not allow that? The Church allows, and must allow, because it is in this free country, subject to the State and the State's tribunals, a very great diversity of view on all points of doctrine. We are not to be confined to this and that "view" or species of orthodoxy (perhaps heterodoxy) just to suit the notions of a writer who cannot express himself in good English.

I found fault with the review of Judge Warren's pamphlet, because I saw in it a narrowness and a censoriousness, the usual accompaniments of a pretentious ignorance. The reviewer's reply to me but manifests more than before his utter ignorance. He says that I introduce "Rome theory of baptism." I allude to it, because the reviewer shows that he does not know that the *opus operatum* doctrine is the Romish doctrine. It would appear as if he never heard the term before; most certainly he does not know its theological meaning. And he speaks of the "conversion" of sinners as if it were to be placed in opposition or contrast to regeneration, and as if the terms are susceptible of being, even in error, interchangeable. B.

17th May, 1890.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

SIR,—Having disposed of the various points raised by "F. T. P.," I will now proceed with my argument.

Dr. Hobart throughout *assumes* the fundamental proposition which he is bound to prove, namely, that there was in existence from the time of Hippocrates to Galen—a period of more than 500 years—a definite technical medical language. Granting, however, for the moment that this was the case, let us ask how the following fifty words (all of which are included in Dr. Hobart's Index) can possibly avail to show that this same technical medical language is to be found in the Third Gospel? Have the doctors any special claim to, or private property in, such words as: *Morning*, *evening*, *noon*, *midnight*, *delay*, *space*, *thought*, *sweetness*, *chance*, *perplexity*, *mist*, *upper room*, *violence*, *crowd*, *successor*, *narrative*, *custom*, *yoke*, *multitude*, *unreasonable*, *descent*, *headlong*, *expectation*, *kindly*, *suddenly*, *immediately*, *recently*, *accurately*, *sorrow*, *safety*, *amiss*, *moist*, *chasm*, *needy*, *eyebrow*, *scorpion*, *confusion*, *evil*, *eye-witness*, *to accuse*, *to help*, *to strengthen*, *to journey*, *to accompany*, *to return*, *to complete*, *to let down*, *to grow*, *to fill*, *to wash?* After this, must we not perforce agree with that critic who says that "the author presses the matter beyond reason, as, for example, in the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. . . . . where even common words, which any man writing on the themes in question would naturally use, are gravely set forth as evidences of Luke's medical character and training, just because these words happen to be employed in a different connection by the old writers on medicine?"

Other words in Dr. Hobart's list, having some slight medical aroma, *e.g.*, *leprosy*, *skin*, *trance*, *madness*, *wound*, are clearly *by no means confined* to technical medical language, and consequently can furnish no proof of professional medical training in the author who uses them. Am I necessarily a duly qualified medical practitioner because I choose to talk of *diet* and *regimen*, or to mention *consumption*, *small-pox*, *fever*, or any of the thousand physical ills that flesh is heir to? Have we not all read a good deal of late in the papers about the *epidemic* of *influenza?* Were these newspaper writers *all* doctors? Dr. Hobart perhaps might endeavour to prove this, but he would, I think, find it hard to convince us. Dr. Hobart's proofs are no proofs at all. The only wonder is that well-known scholars like Dr. Salmon and Dr. Plummer should have been beguiled, the critical faculty having, as it would appear, been lulled to sleep by Dr. Hobart's siren song—"the lovely song of one that hath a very pleasant voice."

Let us scrutinize a little more closely two or three of the words relied on.

At page 183, Dr. Hobart writes: "κηρίον. Honeycomb was often used in medical preparations, either with the honey in it or without (ξηρόν); perhaps for this reason St. Luke adds μελίσσιον." Ten quotations from several medical writers are added and—*prove nothing*. Not to mention Virgil and other classical writers who have something to say on the subject, is not the Bible full of such references? Was not the Promised Land "a land flowing with milk and honey?" Was not the meat of John the Baptist locusts and wild honey? Was not the famous "Mother in Israel" named Deborah = Bee? (Judges v. 7). Did not Jonathan nearly forfeit his life for "dipping his rod in an honeycomb?" (τὸ κηρίον τοῦ μέλιτος, 1 Sam. xiv. 27). Does not the Psalmist use the words "sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb?" (μέλι καὶ κηρίον, Ps. xix. 10). It is clear that any Greek-speaking Jew would be quite familiar with μέλι and κηρίον from the LXX.

Again, page 135, Dr. Hobart says: "ὠόν. Peculiar to St. Luke." Half a page of quotations from the medical writers follow, and again—*prove nothing*. Was Horace a medical man because he wrote *Ab ovo usque ad mala?* Was Job a medical man because he refers to the eggs which the ostrich leaves in the earth; and Isaiah, too, because he talks of the "cockatrice's eggs?" Did none of the "world's grey fathers" ever eat (not to say suck) eggs, until the doctors, with superior skill and knowledge, had shown the way? Nay, were there no naughty boys, in those days of yore when Time was young, who ever went birds' nesting? How can Dr. Hobart seriously ask us to decide in favour of his theory on such evidence as

this? And, still more marvellous, how can the learned University of Dublin sanction such arguments by gravely affixing their official seal in token of approval? Should not Trinity College, Dublin, have saved Dr. Hobart from himself, and prevented his making learning appear ridiculous? "Pure Hebraisms" mistaken for medical language are only a sign of imperfect scholarship or inadequate research, but "eggs"—it is too comical and too absurd!

This sort of thing certainly goes far to justify the dictum of Dr. Weiss: "To profess to discover traces of medical knowledge is mere trifling."

Once more, page 7, Dr. Hobart says: "There is a mark of particularity here—'right hand'—such as a physician would observe. The other Evangelists omit this. The medical writers invariably state whether it is the right or the left member that is affected." But is not "the right hand" continually spoken of in the Bible from Genesis (ch. xlviii., Jacob blessing the sons of Joseph) to Revelation? And notably in the Psalms which to the devout Jew of the Apostolic age were Prayer Book and Hymn Book combined. Are we to infer that the writer of the Book of Jonah was a medical man because of his curious periphrasis, when he says that "six score thousand persons in that great city (Nineveh) could not discern between their right hand and their left hand?" (Jonah iv. 11). And must we conclude that the author of 2 Samuel was a doctor, because, in describing Joab's murderous career, he is careful to give "a mark of particularity such as a physician would observe," by noting that the treacherous Joab invariably smote his unsuspecting victim, with unerring anatomical skill, "under the *fifth* rib?"

After all this, when Dr. Hobart, page 182, would fain persuade us that professional medical knowledge is lurking concealed beneath the word ὀπτός—*roasted*, it seems a sufficient commentary to refer to that which Bo-bo, the lubberly son of Ho-ti, found so enchantingly delicious, namely roast pig.

But enough, and more than enough. Is it not only too evident that Dr. Hobart's ardent imagination has run away with his judgment, and that his *Alma Mater* "restrained him not?" Hence when Dr. Salmon benignly observes: "Dr. Hobart sometimes pushes his argument too far," stern criticism has to make the harsh-sounding rejoinder: "Is there any argument to push?"

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 15, 1890.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Boutflower, Rev. C. H., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Tyne Dock; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Brierley, Rev. J. Henry, M.A., Rector of Whitbourne; Rural Dean of North Frome.
Broughton, Rev. W. B., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Rainow, Macclesfield.
Cameron, Rev. G. H., M.A., Senior Curate of St. George's, Edgbaston; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Birmingham.
Candy, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Vicar of Orton-on-the-Hill, Atherstone.
Carr, Rev. Owen Charles, M.A., Rector of All Saints', Newcastle.
Chilver, Rev. C. S., M.A., Vicar of Lodsworth; Rural Dean of Midhurst, Division II.
Cohu, Rev. J. R., M.A., Head Master of Richmond Grammar School, Yorkshire; Head Master of Hereford Cathedral School.
Ducat, Rev. William Methven Gordon, M.A., Vicar of Cuddesdon, and Principal of the College; Rural Dean of Cuddesdon.
Eddleston, Rev. Thomas, Rector of All Saints', High Roding, Dunmow, Essex.
Evans, Rev. T. H., Vicar of Llanwddyn, Montgomeryshire; Vicar of Minera, Denbigshire.
Gathorne, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Kirkby-on-Bain, Horncastle.
Goodwin, Rev. E. H., B.A., Chaplain to the Forces, 3rd Class; Chaplain to the Forces, 2nd Class.
Grensted, Rev. Frederic Finnis, M.A., Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Gwynne, Rev. C. B., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Matthew's Mission Church in the parish of Holy Trinity, Birkenhead.
Harmer, Rev. J. R., M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham.
Herbert, Rev. George, Vicar of Llanrothal, Monmouth.
Hewett, Rev. W. H., Junr., B.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Eastbourne.
Holt, Rev. Joseph, Curate of St. Catherine's, Tranmere; Chaplain to the Birkenhead Workhouse.
Husband, Rev. C. F., late Curate of Hemsworth, Pontefract; Curate-in-Charge of Cudworth District, near Barnsley.
Jones, Rev. John Thomson, M.A., Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral; Rector of Towyn, Abergele.
Lea, Rev. Thomas, Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Northampton; Rector of Paglesham, Essex.
Lowe, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of St. John's, Cheetham; Rural Dean of Cheetham.
Marshall, Rev. Alfred, M.A., Vicar of Feckenham, Worcestershire.
Marshall, Rev. Thomas Ansell, M.A., Rector of Botus-Fleming, Cornwall.
Napier, Rev. H. P., M.A., Principal of Trinity College, Kandy.
Pereira, Rev. H. H., Rector of St. Lawrence's, Southampton; Rector of Chilbolton, Hants.
Perry, Rev. S. E., M.A., Vicar of Chesterton; Vicar of Littleport, Ely.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Boys, Rev. Algernon, M.A. (Jesus College, Cambridge), Professor of Classics and Public Orator of the University of Trinity College, Toronto, at Toronto, on the 21st ult., aged 43.
Bradshaw, Rev. William, of Barton Blount, and Smalley Rectory, in London, on the 13th inst., aged 49.
Hull, Rev. Richard, Rector of Upper Stondon, on the 12th inst., aged 71.
Lacy, Rev. Charles, M.A., Rector of Allhallows-on-the-Wall, London, at 25, Finsbury-square, on the 17th inst., aged 95.
Macnaught, Rev. John, M.A., formerly Incumbent of St. Chrysostom's, Everton, Liverpool.
Palmer, Rev. George Horsley, formerly Rector of Mixbury, Oxon, at Coldhayes, Liss, Hants, on the 17th inst.
Pitman, Rev. Canon, M.A., Prebendary and Canon of Chichester Cathedral, and for sixty-one years and eleven months Vicar of Eastbourne, at the Vicarage, Eastbourne, on the 13th inst., aged 88.
Steventon, Rev. E. H., formerly Vicar of All Saints', Paddington, at Southborough, on the 14th inst.
Venn, Rev. John, M.A., formerly Vicar of St. Peter's, Hereford, at Aylestone-hill, Hereford, on the 12th inst., aged 88.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE GIFTS OF THE ASCENDED CHRIST.

By the Rev. Prebendary BASSETT, M.A.,
Vicar of Dulverton.

Sermon Preached in Wells Cathedal, on Sunday Afternoon, April 20th, 1890.

"Wherefore He saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."—Eph. iv. 8.

OUR second lesson brings before us a passage which is full of interest to the Christian student. During His ministry on earth, when initiating His disciples into the things of the kingdom, or instructing the crowds that clustered round to hear Him, or when rebuking the self-righteous Pharisee or refuting the sceptical Sadducee, our Blessed Lord made constant reference to the ancient Scriptures—in a word, to the Bible of the Jewish Church as the ground of His authority. To Him it was the rock on which His doctrine as a superstructure was raised.

When unfolding the mysteries of His mission to the favoured twain who supped with Him at Emmaus, He declared, as "He opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures," "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the psalms concerning Me," referring to the well-known tripartite division of the Old Testament current in His day.

The Apostles proved apt scholars of the Great Master of interpretation, for we find St. Peter in the solemn interim between the Ascension and Pentecost citing Psalm cix. as a prediction of the perfidy of Judas, and on the day of Pentecost claiming Psalm xvi. as a prophecy of the resurrection of the promised Holy One. It is needless to say that in his speeches recorded in the Acts and in his Epistles St. Paul provides us with examples of like testimony to the authoritative utterances of the Old Testament Scriptures. It is computed that there are found in the pages of the New Testament no less than 258 direct and unmistakable quotations from the writings of the older covenant; but there are thousands of passages where a word or turn of phrase will suggest to the student's eye some latent or undesigned derivation from the same source.

This correspondence between the two covenants is a feature of great importance in our estimation of the mind of God in imparting to us a written revelation, and of the meaning of the terms in which that revelation is conveyed, and I need scarcely add that such a fact adds no small weight to the apology for the Old Testament in the controversies which are current in our day—a subject which it is not for us to discuss on this occasion.

These quotations from law and prophet and psalm vary much in purpose and in form. Some are direct attestations of God's will, some definite and detailed predictions of things future from the standpoint of the speaker, and some are illustrations of like lines of thought or similar sentiments; but to the careful reader of the inspired page there will be revealed some deep lying undercurrent of thought, which at first baffled this search, but now leaps out of the dark speech, and supplies another ray to the orb of light.

Again, there are some, to which class our text belongs, that present startling differences between the original and the quotation, and the man of sceptical proclivities, and the man of shallow thought and reading, and the man (and alas! this type abounds much in our day) who delights to find some spot to fasten on to depreciate the truth and teaching of the Bible exclaim, each according to his own misconception: Here is a plain and downright error. Here is a loose and incorrect reference; surely the Apostles thought little of the letter of the Scriptures; perhaps they spoke merely on the spur of the moment, or at the least the memory failed, and inaccuracy is the result, and hence inspiration is a fiction. Thus, for example, they say in Psalm lxviii. 19, we find the original passage of which this text is a quotation, and there is the word "receive," "Thou hast received gifts," and here in the New Testament we have the word give, "He gave gifts." This is an open contradiction, for to receive and to give are diametrically opposite the one to the other.

To Christian people, such as I am now addressing, I would plead, by way of preface, that we should remember that if the Old Testament text is inspired and authoritative, so is the New Testament text also, and *vice versâ*. Let us therefore in dependence upon the unction of the Holy Ghost resting upon and sanctifying our efforts examine the text, its interpretation, and its lessons.

The main feature of divergence between the two passages is the clause "Thou hast received gifts for men" and "He gave gifts to men." But before dealing with that difficulty we may venture to cite the entire passage from the psalm, stripping it first of its parallelism, the robe in which Hebrew poetry decks itself, and placing the words in the order in which the sequence and the sense should be presented to the English eye, and, secondly, providing a more exact rendering of the words themselves. For this purpose we must go back as far as the 16th verse of Psalm lxviii.

A mountain of God is Mount Bashan;
A mountain of heights is Mount Bashan;
Why do ye envy, O high mountains,
The mountain which God desired for His dwelling?
Yea, Jehovah will tabernacle there for ever.
The chariots of God are myriads twain;
Jehovah is upon them;
Thousands by thousands multiplied
At Sinai upon the holy place.
Thou hast gone up to the height,
Thou hast received gifts in the man,
Thou hast captive-led a captivity,
Even the rebels also,
That Jah, God might tabernacle there.

The interpretation of the passage is, in simple prose, this. The grand exhibition of the Divine power and presence, which was manifested at the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, is borrowed to lend lustre and glory to the carrying of the Ark up the heights of Zion, which in turn became the type of a far more glorious achievement, the triumph of Christ over all His foes, and His Ascension into the heights of glory. The opening portion of this paragraph corresponds with the close of it, in both which the purpose of the conqueror is set forth, to tabernacle there, to fix His Shekinah, or habitation there for ever. By this arrangement of the words we learn also that the captivity taken captive were those that before were rebels, but were now brought into willing subjection to the victorious King; and further, that He received gifts in the man or manhood, or it possibly may mean, "for mankind."

Let us dwell for a minute on this last word. Supposing the former rendering to be the true one, which is the most literal and is the rendering in the margin of the Authorised Version, we have a foreshadowing of the great doctrine of the two natures in the one person of the Lord Jesus Christ and also the office of Mediator which He sustains for us as the God-man, Immanuel, God with us.

Before the Incarnation the second person in the ever blessed Trinity dwelt in the heart and bosom of the Father, His co-eternal Wisdom, Word and Son. He was properly and wholly Divine, of the same essence with the Father; but when He became man by taking our nature upon Him, He did not cease to be God; He lost nothing of His majesty and glory, but He united to His person the nature of man, and in that two-fold nature, linked together in His one personality, He acts as "the one Mediator between God and men, man Christ Jesus." To this purpose is the declaration made by St. John in the preface of His Gospel. "The Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, became flesh and tabernacled in us," that is, "in our nature," and St. Paul in like manner testifies that the second Man is the Lord from heaven (for we hold this to be the true reading). Such passages confirm the teaching of the text according to the literal rendering. The Psalmist himself might not comprehend the fulness of the mystery of the words he uttered, but the phrase must be accounted for and explained, and the after revelation made of the person and office of the Redeemer interprets the enigmatical enunciation.

This brings us to face and investigate the difficulty, the seeming contradiction between the Psalmist and the Apostle, the opposite statements, "He received," "He gave."

At first sight, as we have said, a solution seems hopeless, and many—most indeed—would feel compelled, however reluctantly, to admit one or other of the charges brought against the letter of Scripture; but all vanishes the moment that the chemistry of criticism is applied as a test to resolve the Word into its primitive elements, and we discover by this process that the word here used for "to receive" implies "To fetch for the purpose of giving." This meaning of the word is found with various forms of construction, as may be seen in several examples in the Old Testament, in Gen. xxxii. 14; Ex. xxxv. 5, and Numb. xix. 2.

The two passages in the Psalm and the Epistle are therefore in perfect harmony. The Psalmist portrays the conquering Redeemer as ascending into Heaven and fetching gifts from God; and the Apostle represents Him as conferring those gifts upon men, whose nature He had assumed and whose salvation He had secured.

The passage which throws most abundant light upon this is found in chap. iii. and verse 34. of the Gospel of St. John, where we read that "God giveth not the Spirit by measure (unto Him)." In the human nature which the Word assumed, Christ received the fulness of the Holy Ghost, by whose power He had been conceived, and from whose anointing the official title of the Messiah, the Christ, the Anointed One, was derived. But for what purpose did He receive? In His divine nature He was One with the Holy Ghost as He was One with the Father, and therefore must have had co-existence and co-equality and co-potentiality with the Holy Ghost; but in the human nature, as the second Adam, the second Man, the Son of Man, the Man, He received the fulness of the Spirit to impart it in measure to man, that is, to His people, "according to the measure of the gift of Christ."

The anointing oil was emptied out upon the head of the Great High Priest, that it might flow down to the lowest of His members, so that "in the man" He received the gifts, and as Man He gives the gifts; He received that He might give as "the Man" "to the men," or, as St. Peter declared on the day of Pentecost, "Being by the right-hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (Acts ii. 33).

And what are the gifts conferred upon the Church as a body and upon the several members of the same? Our minds almost naturally recur to the subjective and spiritual blessings which concern our own religious life and hope, our present faith and sanctification, and the glory that shall be revealed in us.

But, are not these things set forth rather as the purpose and result of the gifts? The gifts that the conquering King distributed among those that had been brought under His sway must be interpreted in the light of the fulfilment, and according to the demands of the context. It is true that the Lord died and rose again that He might win a people for Himself and make them His captives, His willing captives, who should find His service perfect freedom, and should be conformed to His likeness. To this end He gave them of His own Spirit; He poured out of His unmeasured fulness the measure meet for each member of His mystical body. This triumphal gift was first visibly dispensed at Pentecost, when the glory of God, as a globe of light, burst with the sound of a mighty rushing wind into the sanctuary of the Upper Chamber, and tongues of fire were severed from the central source and distributed to the twelve to seal them with the Spirit, to crown their heads with glory, and to inspire them with the life of God. This gracious glory-rain upon the inheritance has never ceased to fall. The Heaven once opened has never been closed. That same Spirit comes down still in the dew of the Holy Word, distilled on thirsty souls, in the gentle breath that inspires prayer, in sacramental mysteries and all the means of grace.

But though these blessings are doubtless gifts that Christ procured for all by His death and resurrection, yet the gifts here specified are defined to be the presence and preservation of a living and perpetuated ministry. "He gave," continued the Apostle, in verse 11, "some" that is, according to a well-known Hebrew mode of expression, He appointed some—to be "Apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers." And the end in view of this divinely appointed ordinance is for the building up of the mystical body of Christ, till all come to the oneness of the faith and the true knowledge of the Son of God to complete the mystical Man, the full development of the Christ as represented in the figure of the Head and the members.

This is a lesson which, in the present fractured and dislocated state of the Christian Church, should not be lost upon us. The sight of the garments of Christ not only divided into four parts, but into fifty times four in our country, and each competitive sect claiming to have won the lot which cannot be rent, should lead us back to first principles.

The Saviour selected twelve, and twelve only, from the crowd of His disciples. To them He gave the command to preach the Gospel, to baptise, to "do this in remembrance of Me;" and on them He breathed, and imparted to them the Holy Spirit for all the functions of the ministry. This order we receive, and echo in our Ordination Service, and thus fall back upon the passage before us that the gifts which the Lord gave from His ascending chariot were gifts of the Spirit as specially pertaining to the ministry

Two thoughts are naturally generated from this exposition. One concerns those that exercise the ministry, and the other the people to whom they minister.

The remembrance of our high and holy calling should ever be present with us when we execute the functions to which we were ordained. According to the teaching of this Scripture we are, or should be, gifts of the ascended Lord to the flocks committed to our charge and to the congregations to which we dispense the means of grace. Whether therefore in private we seek to persuade or rebuke, to comfort or convict, to warn the stout and strong, or console the downcast and the dying; or whether in public we expound, or exhort, or set forth the wealth of the gospel of the grace of God, or whether we minister Holy Baptism or consecrate the Eucharist, or whatever may be the special office which we perform in the Name of Christ, and for the benefit of the Church of God, the one thought, the all-preponderating thought should ever be impressed upon our minds that we are not only ministers of Christ, and representatives of Him who said, "He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that heareth Me heareth Him that sent Me;" but are also gifts lavished by the bountiful hand of our ascended Lord upon His Church and people scattered throughout the whole world. How sweet and yet how solemn a thought should this be to those who in apostolical succession have received the imposition of holy hands. How this consideration should keep in subordination all desires and longings after the things of time, and wean off from the paltry amusements, the worldly, and sometimes worse than worldly, entertainments which a vicious age has, alas! come to regard as the province of the witnesses of a crucified Saviour, and almost the only use for maintaining a clerical body in our midst. Alas! again, are such the gifts of Christ?

How much rather should this knowledge of the divine purpose in separating us to Himself to be His witnesses to the people, be unto us an unction from above, an unction of union with Himself, an unction of His power and presence with us to supply strength in the day of weakness, courage in the hour of opposition, wisdom in perplexity, patience in persecution, humility in the season of success, and gratitude when we see a sinner turned from the error of his way, and the multitude of his sins covered and cancelled in the atoning blood that was shed on the Cross of Calvary. Surely such as have experienced this calling and done such work are in every generation the gifts of Christ.

And what are the lessons for the Church at large to learn, for whose good this ministry was ordained? Oh, brethren, for what real reason is it that you profess the religion of Christ? Why is it that you bring your children to Holy Baptism? why were you confirmed? why do you attend the public services of prayer and praise? why do you listen to

the Word of God read, expounded and enforced? and why do some of you partake of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ? In other words, Why do you make use of the ministry of the Church of God? These are serious and searching questions for each one to answer in the secret presence of God; but does not our context tell us what God's purpose is in providing such means, and what ours should be in the use of them.

There is a latent mixture of two figures in this passage. Christ is compared to the head of a body, and all believers or professors of the faith to the limbs and members of the body. That head and that body are one. They form the mystical Christ, the perfect mystical man, the fulness or completion of the body of Christ? That body is not complete till all the members are made up, till all the called and chosen and faithful have been united in that body. Then comes in the other figure which underlies and interlaces this, an echo of a previous parable, the comparison of the same with a building, in which the head becomes the foundation stone, and the believers the several stones that are reared upon it as a superstructure. This pile is being raised generation after generation till the top-stone shall tell of its completion.

Now, the ministers of Christ are the labourers engaged in this marvellous task of building upon Christ, the one foundation, the vast edifice that is composed of the sanctified and saved. These "gifts of Christ" are appointed to the work of "the perfecting of the saints," the fitting them, like joints, or stones for their proper place and sphere in the body or the building for their own safety, and for the mutual support and strength of the whole structure. Have you found it thus with yourselves? Is this your experience in the sanctuary?

Again, the context proceeds "for the work of the ministry." How various is the work! How it changes with time and circumstances! Some are sent to labour for souls in wild and thinly-peopled districts, among the rustic poor. Some in densely crowded slums and alleys in our vast cities, some in the great centres of learning where all the accomplishments of a well-read and studied intellect are required. Some in missions to the heathen in savage climes, and some to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; but wherever their lot is cast in the providence of God, they have their work to do, and what should be the effect upon their hearers? This passage tells us "until we all meet together into the unity of the faith and the perfect knowledge of the Son of God." Oh, what a blessed consummation! Welcome the day when men shall think alike about all the problems of revelation, and with one heart and one voice sing, "Salvation to Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb for ever and ever." Then shall the mystical man be complete. The head and the members fully formed, and the building finished, the temple of God, the Cathedral of the fulness of Christ.

May God in His mercy hasten that day, and give us, each and all, to have a membership in that body, and a niche in that temple for rest and rejoicing for ever and ever!

THE BETTERMENT OF CHARACTER.

By the Rev. EDGAR C. S. GIBSON, M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College, and Prebendary in Wells Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, on Sunday, April 27th, 1890.

"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these? Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee."—St. John xxi. 15.

YOU will all remember the narrative in which these words find place. The net containing the miraculous draft of fishes has been drawn to land. The disciples have sat down by the fire of coals kindled upon the shore and broken their fast, partaking of the food so mysteriously provided for them. And "when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these?" more than Andrew, the first called, even more than John, the disciple whom Jesus loved. The question is put in this form because Peter had in the past made profession of greater devotion than the others. "Lord, why cannot I follow Thee? I will lay down my life for Thy sake." "Though all should be offended in Thee, I will never be offended." "Though all should deny Thee, yet will not I." Even now it might have seemed as if he professed a deeper devotion and more enthusiastic love than others, for while they were still in the boat, as soon as he heard that it was the Lord who stood on the shore, Peter "girt his fisher's coat unto him and cast himself into the sea" —impatient of their tardy progress—and made his way through the waves to fling himself before the others at his Master's feet. And when the command was given, "Bring of the fish that ye have caught," he was seemingly the first to spring to his feet and obey, for "Simon Peter," we read "went up and drew the net to land." And so the question is asked, probing him to the very depths of the heart, "Lovest thou Me more than these?" and back comes the answer, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." No passage shows more clearly than this the change that has passed over the Apostle since the resurrection; or manifests more emphatically how his former failures have taught him a lesson. Formerly there had been great profession in words, but lamentable failure in action. Now, though he has proved his readiness in action, he will make no boastful profession in words. Three things in his answer are worthy of special notice.

(1.) He drops the "more than these" of his

Lord's question. He will no longer compare himself with others to his own advantage, as he had done so often in the past.

(2.) He appeals to his Lord's knowledge. "Thou knowest that I love Thee"; and again, "Thou knowest all things: Thou knowest that I love Thee." Formerly, he had fancied that he himself knew some things better than his Lord, and on more than one occasion had ventured to instruct Him. When first He announced His coming Passion, "Peter took Him and began to rebuke Him, saying, be it far from Thee, Lord; this shall not be unto Thee," and again at the feet washing: one moment, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," and then the next "not my feet only, but also," etc. All this is now changed. Even on a matter which concerns his own personal feelings he will sooner trust his Master's knowledge than his own. "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee."

(3.) The third significant fact is not manifest to the English reader; but is very clear in the original Greek. St. Peter changes the word for love. He dare not speak of his love by the higher, more spiritual name which Jesus Christ had used. He substitutes another word, and lays claim only to the feeling of warm personal affection, not venturing to claim that he has attained to that higher love which was to be the spring of the Christian life. "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." The answer shows how he is chastened and purified. There is still the same loving, impetuous, warm-hearted nature, still the same eagerness in action, and almost headlong anxiety to do something. Everything that made him so lovable, everything that was characteristic and distinctive of the man at his best is still there, but the old self-confidence and self-assertion which had led to so many falls and failures in the past are all gone now. He has risen on stepping-stones of his dead self to higher things; and so the commission comes. Now he can be trusted. Before, when he professed, "I will lay down my life for Thy sake," he was warned of approaching denial. Now when he shrinks from profession he receives the commission: "Feed my lambs."

Into the subject of that commission we will not enter to-night. Let us content ourselves with considering what light the whole incident throws on the way in which the Gospel of Jesus Christ deals with personal character. Two things are brought out by the passage, both of which require to be fully and frankly recognised. (1.) St. Peter is the same man all through. (2.) Although he is the same, yet a change has passed over his character, not destroying its identity, but ennobling and transfiguring it.

(1.) St. Peter is the same man all through. There is a wonderful identity of character manifest throughout all the notices of him, whether in the Gospels or in the Acts. In one sense, of course, the resurrection of Jesus Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit "made a new man of him." But the phrase must not be taken as if it denoted that his whole type of character was changed. The material of which he was formed was not thrown into the crucible to be melted down, and cast in some altogether new form and shape. You can recognise the man himself all through. There are the same features, only they are transfigured and glorified by a new spirit within, which shines out through them, and imparts a new and unearthly beauty to the familiar lineaments. He remains, I repeat it, the same man with all that was good and lovable about him still there. We have seen that there is still the same almost headlong readiness to act—still the same promptness, zeal, and enthusiasm, manifested by the way in which he casts himself into the water to reach his Lord, and starts up at the first indication of His will, to draw the net to land. He is still as distinct from St. John in personal character and temperament as ever he was.

(2.) And yet, although he is thus distinct, a change has passed over him, not destroying the identity of his character, but ennobling and transfiguring it. While there is so much that we can still recognise, so many features which we delight in tracing there still, yet even a child who reads the Acts of the Apostles is struck by the change. He misses the old self-confidence and self-assertion. Though still impulsive and easily moved, yet he can see that the lower impulses are checked and controlled by the presence of something higher. He who had cowered at the word of a weak woman now stands boldly before the council. He who had denied his Lord before the servants, will bravely confess Him before their masters. All that was good and really characteristic of the man is there still, trained and disciplined so that it stands out more prominently than ever, while all that is weak and feeble has disappeared beneath the action of the Spirit of God.

(3.) In all this there is surely no small lesson for us. It is but one illustration of God's general method dealing with personal character. The grace of Jesus Christ may deal with each one of us as it dealt with the Apostle Peter. Here we are gathered together to-night: this vast congregation made up of so many hundreds of single souls, each stamped with a nature and character that is all his own. Each single one of us with his own past history and experience, a record different from that of every other here. Each single one of us with his own special trials and temptations known in their awful force to none else in precisely the same measure: Each with his own special graces and gifts, his own peculiar joys and his own peculiar sorrows. Each with his own recollections of the past, and hopes for the future that can be shared perfectly by none other on earth. No two exactly alike in temperament and disposition any more than they are in outward lineaments and expression of features.

And what is the grace of God to make of us all? How will it deal with such countless types, and so many varieties of character? I answer that it will deal with them precisely as it dealt with St. Peter.

(1.) And first, it will leave them all as distinct as ever. The restoration of the image of God in the soul is a conservative restoration. It does not destroy a single characteristic feature that is worth preserving. Probably at some time or other we have all been taken over some great manufactory, and admired the wonderful skill and adjustment of the machinery. We saw and handled the rough raw material, perhaps including various kinds and much variety—different sizes and shapes. Then we watched it submitted to the process, whatever it was, and in the end when the work was complete, the variety was gone and the articles were all turned out, of one shape, size, and pattern, uniform throughout, so that the most practised eye could scarce tell one from another. Very different from this is the action of Divine Grace upon human character. There is no mechanical process of artificial production as if saints were manufactured to order, and turned out by machinery. Men are not crushed into a narrow mould which destroys everything distinctive about them. No! in the Church on earth now, as in the Church of the Resurrection hereafter, there is room for endless variety and almost infinite types of character. "The city of God," we read in the Apocalypse, "hath twelve foundations, and in them the names of the Twelve Apostles of the Lamb." And as each of the Twelve Apostles has his own distinctive character, temperament and disposition, so we read that there is marvellous variety of colour and hue in the foundation stones. For "the foundations were adorned with all manner of precious stones." No two are alike. "The first foundation was jasper, the second sapphire, the third a chalcedony, the fourth an emerald, the fifth sardonyx, the sixth sardius, the seventh chrysolite, the eighth beryl, the ninth a topaz, the tenth a chrysophrase, the eleventh a jacinth, the twelfth an amethyst." And this exquisite variety repeats itself wherever the Church of God is set up on earth. It is the peculiar glory of the Catholic Church, as distinct from the sects, that in her there is no monotony of character, no sameness of type. She embraces within her limits the zeal of St. Peter and the love of St. John, the consolation of St. Barnabas and the faith of St. Paul. She finds room for the services of Martha, and the good works of Dorcas, as well as for the contemplation of Mary. She knows how to use the eloquence of a Chrysostom, and the tenacity of an Athanasius, the devotion to Scripture of a Jerome, and the fervour of an Augustine, the winning gentleness of a Francis de Sales, and the untiring energy of a Francis Xavier, the sweetness of a Thomas Ken, and the sanctified learning of a Launcelot Andrews. The Gospel takes each and all of these as it finds them. Their personal characters and gifts are, as it were, baptised into the Church of God. They remain as distinct as ever they were. And so with us here to-day. The faith of Jesus Christ takes each of us as we are, and does not require that everything that is distinctive or original in us be crushed out or swept away. It leaves us, after grace has begun its work in our hearts, and made us realize and claim our Baptismal gift, the same men and women that we were before. It does not require you to be a tame and feeble copy of some one else—the man perhaps through whose instrumentality God has brought home to you the knowledge of His truth. It wants you to be yourself. The more we can realize this, the more natural and simple shall we become. The less will there be that is "put on," artificial and imitative about us. We shall be free from the unrealities and conventionalities that haunt our religion, as the shadow waits on the sunshine. We shall learn to speak and act not for effect, not as we think that someone whom we admire would have us act and speak, but simply and solely as our own heart, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, may prompt us.

(2.) That is one side of the truth about the action of grace on the character, but after all it is only one side. It needs to be supplemented by the other. If it were all, then such maxims as "Be natural," "Follow the instincts of your own heart," would furnish a sufficient guide for life. And, so perhaps, they would, were not the Fall a sad reality. Starting, however, as we do, with a fallen nature, with tendencies to evil and inherited predispositions to certain sins which we dare not leave out of our reckoning, "Be natural" by itself is a very dangerous maxim. All rules for life and maxims for conduct, all plans for the regeneration of the world and the amelioration of society which ignore the great overthrow of the Fall, are foredoomed to failure. It was "natural" to St. Peter to be headstrong and over-confident, and, alas! it is "natural" to some of us to be passionate, or proud, or licentious. And therefore in tracing out the action of Grace on the character, we notice secondly, that while it leaves us still the same men and women, yet it disciplines and trains the character, not destroying its identity, but raising and perfecting it. The woof of human nature must be shot through with the warp of the Holy Spirit's action, and then the whole texture assumes a consistency, aye, and a richness of hue, and a depth of colour which was wanting before. The very purpose for which supernatural grace is given is not to crush and destroy, but to discipline, purify and ennoble this poor fallen and perverted nature of ours. And not till nature has learnt to submit to discipline is the maxim, "Be natural," a safe one. Just as in the physical world all around us man makes use of natural forces, and guides and directs them as he will, so in the spiritual world within grace can lay hold of nature and do anything with it. Think of all the natural forces around us.

How they run to waste till the genius of man steps in to guide and control them; water and steam for instance, or the mysterious electric current. There they are, what we call natural forces—but all running to waste, all simply idle or even destructive, till prisoned, cabined, and confined by the arts of man, and then—well you can do almost anything with them. You turn your mills, and you drive your steam-engines, you light your palaces, and you put a girdle round the earth in forty seconds, and all this because you have—not destroyed or changed, but utilised and directed and mastered the forces of Nature. And so in man. What man can do with the external forces around him, that the grace of God can do in the nature of man. Just as the powers and forces of this world are wasted and desolating until man's controlling hand is there to guide and direct, so without grace all your powers and forces will run to waste and devastate the soul. But, on the other hand, only give Divine grace room to work, and you will find that just those very forces which if left to themseves will work your ruin, will, when guided and directed aright by grace, do most for God. Let me give one illustration of this truth, which is very far-reaching in its application :—

> "How many a father have I seen,
> A hearty man among his boys,
> Whose youth was full of foolish noise,
> Who wears his manhood hale and green."

So sings the poet, but I will go further, and venture to say that I have sometimes seen such an one who not merely "wears his manhood hale and green," but dedicates his whole life and all its powers to the service of Jesus Christ, for just those healthy animal spirits, and that vigour of joyous life which leads to the "foolish noise," and the buffoonery—or that giant strength which must expend itself on something, and find its natural outlet on the river, or in the cricket field, and which when no nobler object is at hand, leads a man, as he says, to "let off steam" in bear fighting: —all this strong mighty force, which if left to itself will simply run to waste, is just what Divine grace loves to lay hold of, and utilise for the evangelisation of the world. We have seen it in Selwyn and Patteson, and a hundred others in the past; we saw it but yesterday in the life of James Hannington, the African Bishop and Martyr. We see it today when our public schools are touched with the enthusiasm of mission-work in our large towns, and when Oxford and Cambridge vie with each other in sending their choicest sons to work in the East-end of London. That is but a single illustration. Time forbids me to follow out the subject further. But you will find that the law holds good whatever your character and temperament may be. Only yield yourself unreservedly into God's hand that He may work His work upon you. You need not be afraid that you will lose anything that is worth preserving. You need not fear that your nature will be altered and destroyed. It will be given back to you with everything that is distinctive and characteristic there still, but bright with a new and unearthly charm which it never knew before. It has been finely pointed out that when God takes a man into His hand to work His work upon him, it is like the sacrament of His love. Bread and wine—common elements of the earth are taken. Hallowed words are spoken, and the bread is crushed and broken in the hand of God's priest. And now, though its substance is there still unaltered, yet from henceforth it is reverently handled, and spoken of in hushed tones as the "Body of Jesus Christ." So God takes into His hand a common man, such as you or me. The heart is crushed and broken in penitence. God speaks His word of blessing. And henceforth the man is the same man as before, but somehow or other he is higher and better for that awful consecration.

It was so with St. Peter after the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. It may be so by God's mercy with each single one of us here to-night.

THE Bishop of Truro preached at the cathedral to a crowded congregation on Sunday morning last, for the first time since his return to the diocese.

THE *Globe* states "on authority" that there is no foundation whatever for the rumour that the Bishop of London contemplates the resignation of his see. The *Daily Telegraph* says that his lordship is credited with a hope that the Lord Chancellor, who is patron of the living, will present a dignitary from the diocese of Exeter to the rectory of Allhallows, London-wall, vacant by the death of the Rev. Charles Lacy, and thus enable London to have a third Suffragan-Bishop. "The new arrangement, subject to the Lord Chancellor's approval, would secure for North London the adequate episcopal supervision now extended to East and West London." The same journal states that his lordship is about to proceed to Wiesbaden, to consult an eminent specialist in regard to his sight. "Of late it has become very much weaker, but fortunately many of the reports in circulation are greatly exaggerated."

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows :—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 31, 1890.

GERMAN MILITARY DESPOTISM.

GERMANY can promptly place three million citizens under arms, in active service; and meanwhile, even in time of peace, the Government maintains a heavy grasp upon their actions and modes of life. Even the German Church, with its ministry, is virtually a department of the State; and the interests of the War Office are held, by the Government, to be paramount, even to those of the Church and of Christianity, and they are accordingly enforced, as such, at the expense of the latter, whenever occasion arises.

If any association, or committee, is formed in Germany, for philanthropic, literary, moral, or other progressive objects, its members must all have their names enrolled at the nearest police-office, and thus are at once brought under that special "police-supervision," which in England is rightly reserved for habitual criminals and discharged convicts.

Sentiments expressive of individual freedom and personal responsibility to God alone, in religious or moral matters, which in England or America may be proclaimed, loud-voiced, from any and every platform, may only be uttered in Berlin, as with bated breath and in whispers, lest the almost omnipresent and omnipotent police should arrest or denounce the speaker. But the State scarcely interferes, if at all, with immoral licence. The grossest vice is tolerated, if not positively fostered, by the military *régime;* but, directly any moral reform, or pacific progress is advocated, then the argus eyes of a most suspicious bureaucracy are on the alert immediately; then, too, the soldier, or the policeman, grasps his sword, and is in the attitude of attention, and ready to pounce on his prey relentlessly.

And, what is perhaps the worst feature of all, is that the German people themselves love to have it so. Men and women, and especially the latter, have been so long dazzled by the ever-prominent glorification of arms and of martial prowess, that they are proud of the system which oppresses them. Like kicked spaniels, they lick the foot which contemptuously spurns their rights of citizenship. Then, too, the vested interests, the titles, customs, rewards, and social and industrial advantages, connected with this vast military bureaucracy, are so enormously influential, that general discredit and suspicion become attached to any persons, or ideas, that are not in harmony with the ruling system and its principles.

The German women are too willingly the slaves of this militarism. And the army officers, everywhere, from the Emperor downwards, discourage especially the idea of the intellectual emancipation of women. Even the universities and the professions of Germany still withhold from the fair sex those honours and privileges of learning which have long since been accorded to them in America, England, and other countries. It is matter of notoriety that the noble aspirations and endeavours of Queen Victoria's intelligent daughter, the Empress Frederick, were sneered at and effectually counteracted by Bismarck and his associates in the Government. Even that illustrious lady's position and character did not protect her from the gross rudeness of vulgar nicknames, with which she was insulted by eminent military and State authorities.

THE TIME OF JACOB'S TROUBLE.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE PURPORT OF REVELATION XII.

BY THE REV. RALPH W. HARDEN, B.A.

(*Continued from page* 234.)

PART II.

IF not the Church then, who is it that is symbolised by the "Woman arrayed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars?" Can we single out any one people or nation upon earth which in its character and history, as well as in the forecast of its future, fully corresponds to the several details of the prediction? And for answer I point to God's nation of Israel.

(*a*) And this, first, because the historic features ascribed to the woman in St. John's vision are exactly parallel to those given of the Jewish nation by the prophet Micah. Read the fourth and fifth chapters of his prophecy and we obtain the following statements concerning that people.

(1.) They shall be *a strong nation to whom the first dominion shall come.* "The kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem" (Mic. iv. 7, 8).

(2.) The nation is described as in the throes of affliction. "Pangs have taken thee as a woman in travail" (iv. 9).

(3.) A captivity and redemption are then ascribed to her. "Now shalt thou go forth out of the city, and thou shalt dwell in the field, and thou shalt go even to Babylon, there shalt thou be delivered; there shall the Lord redeem thee from the hand of thine enemies" (iv. 10).

(4.) And lastly, we have His birth recorded who is to be *ruler in Israel*. "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will he give them up until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto (Rev. Vers. marg. *with*) the children of Israel. And he shall stand and feed (marg. *rule*) in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God" (v. 2, 4).

With these passages before us, it is impossible not to feel that what the Holy Spirit signifies to St. John by the *woman* is the Jewish nation depicted by the same Spirit to the prophet Micah; that she is *the travailing woman* from whom is sprung the Ruler who "shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord." But the Old Testament prophet gives us an additional light, by which we can discern the secret of the devil's hatred to the woman and her seed. "Thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion, the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem" (Mic. iv. 8). The prince of this world *knowing that he hath but a short time*, cannot brook the existence of the people to whom "the kingdom shall come."

(*b.*) Then again the symbolic description of the *woman* in Revelation confirms still further this identification of her with the Jewish nation. She is pictured as "arrayed with the sun and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars." It is not necessary to do more than instance Joseph's dream (Gen. xxxvii. 9) in which we have the germ of this imagery, and in recording which the Holy Spirit appears to have preserved for ever to Israel this symbol of the sun, moon, and stars.

Some, it is true, have contended that by the sun "the Church is represented as the bearer of true heavenly light."* But nowhere do the Scriptures so depict the Church, and least of all in this book of the Apocalypse. Here it is, the *candlesticks* (Rev. i. 20) that are assigned to her as symbols, the Church, in herself and members, being light bearers (φωστῆρες) on earth through the long darkness of its night (Phil. ii. 15). And when this has passed away before the rising beams of the Sun of Righteousness, it is no longer earth, but heaven that shall be the Church's dwelling-place and home during the period of millennial glory. But what we have here displayed, though the sign is seen in heaven, is nevertheless a glory that shall be manifested upon the earth; such a glory in fact as Isaiah beheld in the vision of Israel's future: "The sun shall be no more thy light by day; neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down; neither shall thy moon withdraw itself; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended" (Isa. lx. 19, 20). And in that grand Messianic Psalm (lxxxix.) both *sun* and *moon* are employed to denote the glory and perpetuity of the Davidic kingdom: "His seed shall endure for ever, and His throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven"* (Psa. lxxxix. 36, 37).

(*c.*) Once more, I take the woman of this vision to represent the Jewish nation, because her condition in the world from the date of her Son's rapture is exactly that which has belonged to Israel among the nations during the entire interval. The woman, as I have already pointed out, has fled and is in the wilderness. That is to say, her home is forsaken, her place desolate, she herself a wanderer and in obscurity, until some little while before the dragon shall single her out as a mark for his hostility.

Now mark how all this tallies with Israel's history from the days of Christ. Driven from her land, and still forbidden to return,† the people *as a nation* are lost to sight. They are not annihilated—far from it. But in no country of the world have they, as yet, found any recognition as a separate nationality. They are in the wilderness.

(*To be continued.*)

* Auberlen, "Daniel and St. John," page 245.

* If Auberlen's view of the moon's symbolic character be correct, St. John's vision will apply to Israel's position, during the millennium with a force and accuracy such as cannot at all belong to the Church in this dispensation. He says, "Daniel and St. John," page 245 note, "The moon stands above sea and earth, she is a light in the heavens; but yet she belongs altogether to earth and earthly relations; she is not capable of dispersing the darkness and changing it into day. She thus represents the relations of the world in its essential spirit to the supernatural world; she represents heathenism, the cosmic religion." If this be an adequate explanation of the symbol, then Isaiah's prediction of the time when the heathenism of the world shall be put under the foot of Israel will fully meet in its accomplishment all the requirements of the vision: "I will make the place of my feet glorious. The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet, and they shall call thee the City of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel" (Isa. lx. 13, 14).

† "The Jewish immigration has been checked by a regulation of the Porte prohibiting Jews from settling in Palestine, and restricting their residence in the country to a period of three months." "Report of Mr. N. T. Moore, H.B.M. Consul at Jerusalem," May 5th, 1887.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION *AND* DARWINISM.

SIR,—In your last issue Mr. Henslow quotes Darwin's own opinion as to his theory, namely, "There is grandeur in this view of life." Let me, as a commentary, add these further words of Darwin: "Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits. . . . This creature . . . . would have been classed among the quadrumana. . . . . The quadrumana . . . . are *probably* derived . . . . from some reptile-like or some amphibian-like creature, and this again from some fish-like animal." Again, "The disappearing of the tail does not specially concern us. Nevertheless, it may be well to own, that no explanation, as far as I am aware, has ever been given of the loss of the tail by certain apes and men." And "unless we wilfully close our eyes, we may, with

our present knowledge, approximately recognise our parentage, nor need we feel ashamed of it." Well, sir, I for one must honestly confess that I should feel most heartily ashamed of such parentage, and so far from recognising it, I should never cease to protest against it. I entirely fail to see "the grandeur" of Darwin's view of life, and not to speak of the Psalmist I greatly prefer Shakspeare's account, "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving, how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god!" And in reading such evolutionary and revolutionary nonsense, I can only exclaim, with the same master-mind, speaking not for an age, but for all time, "Ere I would change my humanity with a baboon!"—that humanity which Kant, with true philosophic insight, pronounced to be itself a dignity. With Lord Beaconsfield in this controversy as to ape or angel I am certainly on the side of the angels.

2. Mr. Henslow further reminds us of Darwin's remark, "I see no good reasons why the views given in this volume ['Origin of Species'] should shock the religious feelings of any one." The author of the "Origin of Species" has, however, said elsewhere, "I do not believe that any revelation has ever been made. With regard to a future life, every one must draw his own conclusions from vague and contradictory probabilities." This statement must certainly shock the religious feelings of any one who believes 1 John v. 11, 12, and who has been taught that Christianity has "brought life and immortality to light" (2 Tim. i. 10)—and, indeed, must be a blow to any one who holds that "the hope of immortality hath ever been the leading light of man."

3. Mr. Henslow says: "With regard to the living world, cultivation shows that plants and animals can vary indefinitely." No, I venture to say not *indefinitely*. That they can and do vary may be seen from the different varieties of the rose, and from the different races of mankind—the European, the Negro, and the Mongol. But they can only vary within definite limits—the limits of their own species, and only to the law of the Creator: "Thus far shalt thou come and no further." The very first page of Scripture teaches us that "God created . . . every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, *after their kind*, and every winged fowl *after his kind:* and God saw that it was good." "And God said let the earth bring forth . . . . the herb *yielding seed*, and the fruit tree *yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself*, upon the earth, and it was so. And the earth brought forth . . . . herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit, *whose seed was in itself, after his kind:* and God saw that it was good." (Gen. i. 11, 12, 21.) Nature's great responsive *Amen* to this *fiat* of the Creator that each plant and animal should be brought forth *after his kind* is found in the remarkable fact of the sterility of hybrids. If plants and animals can vary indefinitely, why is this the case? And why the strict command in Lev. xix. 19, which occurs in the midst of warnings against those "abominable customs," one of those "which defiled the land?" The Israelites were bidden not to commit such "abominations lest the land should spue them out," "as it spued out the nations that were before them" (Lev. xviii. 27, 28). No, plants and animals can NOT "vary indefinitely," and I venture to say "that animals and plants are derived by descent, with modification" is NOT "an infinitely more probable theory than they were created "after their kind." "One thing is certain," says Dr. Carruthers, president of the Linnæan Society, "that the whole testimony of the vegetable kingdom, as it is known to us from the remains preserved in the stratified rocks, is opposed to the doctrine that the development is due to evolution by descent." As to embryology, it is, I believe, only ardent Evolutionists who find facts to suit them. As that distinguished savant, M. De Quatrefages, says, "All who wish to remain faithful to true science, will accept the existence of species as a primordial fact." "Species is then a reality." And he also observes, "I wish that candid men . . . would . . . . study for themselves all these facts . . . . and I am perfectly convinced that they will with the great men of whom I am only the disciple—with Linnæus, Buffon, Lamarck, Cuvier, Geoffroy, Humboldt, and Müller, arrive at the conclusion that *all men belong* to the same *species*, and that there is but *one species of man.*

4. Mr. Henslow also says that Sir Charles Lyell, a leader in geology, "carefully investigated the theory, and then accepted it." Yes, but only after the greatest doubt and hesitation. Sir Charles Lyell wrote that "species have a real existence in Nature, and that each was endowed at the time of Creation with the attributes and organisation by which it is now distinguished." In the 6th edition of the "Origin of Species" (Jan., 1872) Darwin writes, "The most eminent palæontologists, namely, Cuvier, Agassiz, Barraude, Pictet, Falconer, E. Forbes, and all our greatest geologists, &c., as Lyell, Murchison, Sedgwick, &c., have unanimously, often vehemently, maintained the immutability of species. But Sir Charles Lyell now gives the support of his high authority to the opposite side." But, in these circumstances, is Sir Charles Lyell's authority so very high? Who can say that he would not by this time have gone back to his original opinion.

5. I must be excused from following Mr. Murphy in his daring flight of fancy as to what "Mr. Evans would probably write, were he writing only 30 years, after the publication of Newton's *Principia.*" The point of my remark remains, that it is a pity that the Evolutionists keep up this deafening hubbub and hullabaloo, insisting that we should adopt their plausible theory when it appears that they have really nothing definite or useful to tell us. We don't care so much about knowing how many species of eyeless fishes may be existing in sunless caves, as we long for daylight and sunshine on the path and the goal of life. Science is perhaps not to be blamed for her ignorance—her ignorance of all "origins," of the secret of beauty, of the essence of gravity, of electricity, &c., &c.—that may be her misfortune, and not her fault. I only blame her for so noisily proclaiming her own ignorance, and for palming off plausible theories and scientific dogmas (more dry and dead than mammoth bones) as useful discoveries and nourishing mental food for living men. Science, while professing to interpret facts, ignores the great fact of Sin, and in the presence of Death, the greatest fact of all remains both dumb and paralysed. Mr. Murphy claims Sir John Herschel as an Evolutionist; but not very long ago Mr. Gladstone wrote: "Among the persons of very high authority in natural science . . . who held the general accordance of the Mosaic cosmogony with the results of modern inquiry, are Cuvier and Sir John Herschel." Mr. Murphy further says: "I do not think there is the slightest value to be attached to the opinions of Mr. Thring, Lord Hatherley, and

Carlyle on the merits of the theory of evolution . . . . It is a very mild judgment to say that the man who can call it 'nursery babble' proves nothing but his own incompetence." No doubt these distinguished men did not claim to be specialists in natural science. But then it has been truly pointed out that we go to the specialist for *evidence*, which may, or may not be, valuable; but we do not appoint him to be *judge*. And these eminent men took a wider, deeper, a less biassed, and a more common sense view than is possible to the mere scientific specialist possessed by his own particular theory. While undoubtedly facts established by sufficient evidence must always carry the day, the adverse opinion of three such great men, in wholly different walks of life, is a very strong reason against our hastily accepting this theory, however plausible. "Incompetence" was certainly not exactly the characteristic with which Mr. Thring seemed to impress his friends. For 35 years—more than a generation—he presided over one of the foremost public schools in this country, and with pre-eminent success (not ablyat on egreat crisis), Who sees more of life and character, who knows more of the subtle workings of human nature with all its weaknesses and all its wants, than the master of such a school? How did evolution, as a rational explanation of "things in general," appear to him? Simply as "nursery babble."

Lord Hatherley, sometime Lord Chancellor, and for many years an eminent judge (also at one time in the House of Commons) was for 40 years a Sunday School teacher in Westminster—that drunken, dissipated, poverty-stricken neighbourhood. Surely he had an opportunity of knowing something of men and manners; he must have noted some of the chief scenes in the strange, eventful history of life, and have learned a little as to the crying wants of mankind. As a judge, too, he must have been accustomed to weigh facts and to sift evidence. Well, what is his judgment on evolution, as the revelation we are all waiting for? He simply utters an impatient lament over "the folly of this stuff." Carlyle, the historian of the greatest moral convulsion in the modern history of mankind, the rugged, honest, outspoken prophet of the 19th century, boldly rebuking, like another John Baptist, the follies and the vices, the humbug and hypocrisy with which present-day society is honeycombed—what has he to say about evolution as the true clue to the secret of the universal "deluded insanity."

It is all summed up, and the opinion of these great men, seems fully justified when science, in the person of one of its chief representatives, pronounces Darwin's boasted theory to be "The Law of Higgledy Piggledy."

No, sir, in spite of all that your two correspondents have urged the words quoted at the close of my last letter remain true, and they cannot be too often repeated, or too widely made known. Darwin's influence has been more hostile to Theism than that of any other writer since the foundation of Christianity itself . . . . He violated the deepest instincts of humanity, and opened a door to Atheism. That Darwin should have swayed opinion for 30 years is a reproach to the age; but the system has had its day. Men are rising up who will destroy it.

H. HEBER EVANS.

May 22nd, 1890.

P.S.—I fail to see that "Evolution" is an unsuitable title for a letter dealing with Darwinism. I am ready, however, to admit with Canon Liddon that there is evolution and evolution. Everyone knows that Darwin did not invent evolution—he borrowed largely from his grandfather. And (not to speak of Ovid) the notion itself is at least as old as Lucretius, who, indeed, is said to have "made his system of the Universe so comprehensive that modern materialists have added absolutely nothing to his conception, but have simply confirmed at certain points, by observation and experiment, what he had reasoned out from his speculative postulates."

But it was Darwin, who with the help of his "agent," Professor Huxley (as Darwin himself designates him), decked out and disguised in the war-paint and feathers of the *Times* reviewer, made evolution current coin. Till then it was scouted by sensible men as a vain imagination of benighted and degraded paganism, or as a "fond thing vainly invented" by some eccentric philosopher (*e.g.* Lord Monboddo) whom perhaps much learning had made mad. It was Darwin who really first changed the fanciful speculation into a plausible theory, and gave this theory—the greatest libel on God and man—legs to run to and fro on the earth and to do infinite mischief by materialising the masses of mankind. Darwinism is in fact one of the latest and worst species of evolution; and, in this instance, not even Darwin himself (who was a patient student and thoughtful observer) can deny that the origin of species involved thought, will, and creative effort.

H. H. E.

THE BENNETT JUDGMENT MISUNDERSTOOD OR MISREPRESENTED.

SIR,—This judgment is often referred to both in England and Ireland as if it were a sanction of Mr. Bennett's doctrine and teaching. Now, Mr. Bennett, in his first edition of "The Church and the World," p. 3, taught the "visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our Churches." This "visible" goes even beyond Romish doctrine. At p. 14 again he says, "Who myself adore, and teach the people to adore the consecrated elements." These astounding statements he repeated in a second edition. However, before his trial came on, he brought out a third edition, in which "visible" was left out, and "adore the consecrated elements" is made to give place to "adore Christ present," etc. Whether we are to suppose that Mr. Bennett changed his opinions, or was only more cautious, it is hard to say. But we may pass over the first two editions, and confine ourselves to the last, which alone was before the Privy Council. The decision is before me, and I confess myself astonished at the way in which an Irish Church paper speaks of it this week. It says, quoting as it were, the judgment, with inverted commas, "the judgment in the Bennett case, which decided that it was lawful to teach, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, that Christ is adorable, present in the Sacrament 'under the form of bread and wine,' and that 'under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'" Now, any one would think that these quotations were from the sentence of the Privy Council, whereas they are from the writings of Mr. Bennett, on which the decision of the Privy Council was that they "are rash and ill-judged, and perilously near a violation of the law." And yet this very language is thrust into the mouths of the judges, as if they used them instead of condemning them. But perhaps I had better give some more of the judgment. "Some of

their Lordships have doubted whether the word 'adore,' though it seems to point rather to acts of worship, such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration, or prayers addressed to Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements, or of any corporal or natural presence therein." Of course, Mr. Bennett and his admirers would spurn such an interpretation of their acts and belief as the Privy Council charitably puts upon them. But we must hear the decision further. "Upon the whole, their Lordships, not without doubts and division of opinions, have come to the conclusion that the charge is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require. Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt that may exist. His language has been rash, but, as it appears to the majority of their Lordships, that his words can be construed so as not to be plainly repugnant to the two passages articled (the Black Rubric and the 28th Article) their Lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised." Thus Mr. Bennett escaped with the skin of his teeth by his words being allowed to bear an interpretation which he would have spurned as Puritanical in the extreme. But, be that as it may, it was an extraordinary thing for an editor of a Church paper to put into the judges' mouths the very language which they condemned as "rash," and "perilously near a violation of the law." We hope that this exposure will prevent people in future from quoting this decision as in favour of Mr. Bennett. It should also be a warning to people not to quote decisions secondhand. As to the judges agreeing with Mr. Bennett, so far were they from doing so that they seem to have flown off in the opposite direction, and to have denied with Hooker that the presence is to be sought with the bread, or anywhere else but in the heart of the receiver, which seems to me to contradict the definition of a Sacrament in the Church Catechism.

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE.
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

THE Wesleyans of the Whitby and Darlington district, which is situated for the most part within the borders of the diocese of Durham, at their annual district meeting, held at Barnard Castle, passed a resolution welcoming the Bishop of Durham to his diocese, and congratulating his lordship on his enthronement, which was suitably acknowledged by the bishop.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allwork, Rev. Arthur, M.A., Vicar of Donington ; Vicar of St. Paul's, Southwark.
Armour, Rev. W., Clerk in Orders in Manchester Cathedral.
Ashdown, Rev. George M., M.A., Rector of Wrington, Somersetshire.
Atkinson, Rev. Walter Chetwynd, M.A., Curate of Winkfield ; Senior Curate of Burg.
Awdry, Rev. W. Canon C. H., M.A., Chaplain at Harlham ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Wilts.
Box, Rev. W. C., Rector of Polebrooke, Northamptonshire.
Brown, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Milton, Northamptonshire ; Rector of Didcot.
Browne, Rev. A. H., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.
Carpenter, Rev. J. H., M.A., Vicar of Rainow, Cheshire.
Cotes, Rev. W. E. H., M.A., Vicar of St. John the Baptist, Great Marlborough-street.
Cracroft, Rev. R. W., Rural Dean of Hills No. 11.
Crowdy, Rev. J. Gordon, M.A., Precentor of Winchester Cathedral ; Rector of Sherfield-on-Loddon, Hants.
Daniell-Bainbridge, Rev. R. P., M.A., Vicar of Ainderby Steeple, Yorkshire.
Danks, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Richmond, Yorks ; Rural Dean of Richmond West.
Dickinson, Rev. Henry Baron, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Streatham.
Drury, Rev. T. W., M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.
Everitt, Rev. C., M.A., Vicar of St. Andrew's, Hoxton.
Graham, Rev. J., M.A., Rector of Asterby-with-Goulceby, Lincolnshire.
Halpin, Rev. A. N., M.A., Chaplain to the Reading Union.
Harris, Rev. R. W., M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.
Jenkins, Rev. D., M.A., Vicar of Tideford, St. Germans ; Rural Dean for the Deanery of East.
Jennings, Rev. H. E., M.A., St. Antholin Lecturer at St. Mary Aldermary.
Lawrence, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of Shilton, Oxon.
Lester, Canon J. H. M., Rector of Lexden, Colchester ; Warden of the Mission Preachers of the Church Parochial Mission Society.
Marriott, Rev. H. P., B.A., Rector of Upham, Hants.
Moore, Rev. H. A., M.A., Vicar of Hanover Chapel, Regent-street.
Ormsby, Rev. G. Albert, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Walworth ; Sunday early morning Lecturer at St. Swithin's, Cannon-street.
Parry, Rev. M. Scarlett, M.A., late Curate of St. Peter's, Chester, and Assistant Master of the King's School ; Vicar of Holy Cross, Bobbington, Stourbridge.
Peek, Rev. R., M.A., Chaplain at Dinard.
Petit, Rev. P., M.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of London.
Pigott, Rev. Edward, M.A., Rector of Puddimore, Milton.
Plant, Rev. A. W., M.A., Chaplain to the *Howe*.
Poole, Rev. G. R., Vicar of Wartling, Sussex.
Potts, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Aubourn, Lincoln.
Price, Rev. C. P., Rector of Festiniog-cum-Maentwrog.
Robinson, Rev. Charles John, M.A., Vicar of Horsham ; Surrogate for the Archdeaconry of Chichester.
Sprye, Rev. T. de L., Rector of Arlington, Devonshire.
Swann, Rev. Johnson Fowell, B.A., Rector of Gunhouse-with-Burringham, Doncaster.
Swann, Very Rev. R., late Dean of Nassau ; Rector of Markolm, Peterborough.
Taglis, Rev. R. E., Curate of Christ Church, Doncaster ; Incumbent of Drumochty, in the Diocese of Brechin.
Thompson, Rev. G. A., M.A., Head Master of Hipperholme Grammar School, Yorkshire ; Head Master of Richard Collin's School, Horsham.
Trower, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of Wortley ; Vicar of Otley, Yorkshire.
Vaughan, Rev. Robert, Curate-in-Charge of St. Mary's, Tyne Dock, South Shields ; Perpetual Curate of St. John-in-the-Vale, Keswick.
Vincent, Rev. Marshall Clarke, M.A., formerly Vicar of Charlton-All-Saints', Wilts; Incumbent of Rotunda Chapel, Dublin.
Whitworth, Rev. R. H., Vicar of Blidworth ; Chaplain to Colonel Seely, D.L., High Sheriff of Nottinghamshire.
Wilson, Rev. Studholme, M.A., Rector of Millbrook, Southampton ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Winchester.
Wright, Rev. A. C., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Colgate, Sussex.
Wynch, Rev. John William, M.A., Vicar of Brizenorton, Oxon.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Garbett, Rev. Arthur Charles, M.A., at Holy Trinity Vicarage, Southwell, on the 20th inst., aged 42.
Lindsell, Rev. Henry Bayly, B.A., Trinity College, Oxford, at Holme, Biggleswade, on the 20th inst., aged 27.
Mortimer, Rev. M. L., M.A., Vicar of Norton, Stockton-on-Tees, on the 20th inst., aged 61.
Streane, Ven. Lewis Henry, M.A., formerly Rector of Delgany, co. Wicklow, and Archdeacon of Glendalough, on the 17th inst., aged 75.
Williams, Rev. David, Canon Residentiary of St. David's, at Llanelly Vicarage, on the 17th inst., aged 64.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE INSPIRATION OF SELECTION.

By the Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached before the University at St. Mary's, Oxford, on Whitsunday.

"He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you."—St. John xvi. 14.

THIS is the heart of the promise which our Saviour made to His disciples, when, with the feelings of bewilderment and desolation that were natural at the time, they were gathered round Him in the supper-room. The day, they felt, was near when they would no longer see and hear, at any rate, as heretofore, the wise and gracious Friend Who had taught and was teaching them so much that was best worth knowing. And He did not directly combat or relieve the sad anticipation. Nay, He told them frankly that He was leaving them; that in a little while they would not see Him, because he was going to the Father. But His place, He said, would be taken by Another Who would not disappoint them; but Who would only arrive when He had Himself departed. "If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." And what was this Envoy and Successor to achieve when He did come? He was, no doubt, to change the hearts and minds of those who were outside the sacred fold. He was to "convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." But He was also to do a yet greater service for the orphaned Church. "When the Comforter is come, Whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth Which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of Me." . . . . "He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak." . . . . "He shall glorify Me; for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath are Mine; therefore said I, that He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you."

That this promise would be kept became clear to the Apostles on that solemn occasion, the anniversary of which the Church observes to-day. When the crucified and risen Lord had ascended into heaven there was an interval of hushed and awful expectation before the promised Comforter came down. And when He came, essential Spirit though He was, He condescendingly came in such guise that the senses of men should apprehend His approach. He came as a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind; His arrival was pourtrayed in tongues like as of fire, which rested upon the Apostles; it was followed by such sudden endowment of a band of Galilean peasants with a gift of speech in various dialects as to astonish a mixed multitude of men who represented almost every race and district between the Tiber and the Euphrates. These were but outward signs, marking the advent of a supernatural power: this was the birthday of the Church of Christ. As our Lord Jesus Christ Himself had been conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, so the society, which was to perpetuate among men His mind and His life, sprang from a kindred union between the Eternal Spirit, and a sample—sufficiently poor and unrepresentative it might have seemed, yet still a sample—of our common humanity; and thus the little community, hallowed and invigorated from on high, entered on the career which has already lasted for nearly nineteen centuries, and which will end only with the close of time.

I. We have to consider, first of all, that particular account of the work of the Holy Spirit which our Lord here sets before us—"He shall glorify Me." The prediction belongs to that class of His sayings which only admits of moral justification if the speaker is indeed more than man. Natural modesty and good taste, not to speak of distinctively Christian virtues, would make such language impossible in the mouth of any honest and humble man who knew himself to be no more than man, and was conscious of the failure and weakness which in every merely human life must so largely outweigh any solid claims to glory or renown. And our Lord's words cannot be understood to foretell any gradual accumulation and wreathing of titles or doctrines round His person, by the devotional or speculative activity of a later time, if, in fact, He had no exact right to that which they implied. No being, whether divine or human, is really glorified by having anything ascribed to him which is not his. The Cæsars were not glorified; they were only made ridiculous, as the wiser of them saw, by official or popular apotheosis. In proportion to a man's perception of the truth of things and the directness and integrity of his moral nature is his dislike of any exaggerated praise. And when we give glory to God we do not and cannot add to that which already belongs to Him; we only make a place in our own hearts, and, it may be, in the hearts of others, for some more adequate apprehension than as yet exists of what He is and what is His due.

When, then, our Lord said that the Spirit of Truth would glorify Him He meant only that the Spirit of Truth would enable men to do justice to the real character of His life and Person. And there were then, as generally, causes enough at work to make such assistance needful. There were

the passions of powerful classes, which made up the great majority of His countrymen, and which were bent on nothing less than casting out His very name as evil. There was the ordinary decay of memory, which would in a few years overtake His most intimate companions. And there was the more perilous activity of fancy, which might substitute for the preservation and exhibition of facts the fictions, or at least the decorative embellishments, of theory or enthusiasm.

A great deal is said about the power and endurance of posthumous influence; but after all how little can a man generally reckon on it! It is, in ordinary human experience, out of a man's keeping; it takes its own course, or the course which events prescribe for it. It falls into the hands of some clever adventurer and is manipulated for his own purposes; or it is of a kind to discover unsuspected ingredients, any one of which in its exaggeration may give it a fatally false turn; or it is crowded out of its due place by more vigorous and self-asserting competitors for public favour; or it shows early symptoms of being in a decline, and presently dies of exhaustion. A posthumous influence! It is wedded to a philosophy like that of Socrates, which may presently break up into two or more contending schools of thought; or it is embodied in a political inheritance, like that of Alexander, which may be distributed among three or four successors, whose jealous rivalries are fatal to its permanent integrity; or it is a literary or artistic tradition, which in the mere act of passing into other keeping is transformed or dissolved through contact with new and powerful minds. A posthumous influence! It must, alas! be made over to the care of others, whether they be foes or friends; whether children or disciples. The biography of a modern philosopher has taught us that friends may not always be its safest guardians; Marcus Aurelius lived long enough to discover what weight would be attached to his meditations when the Cæsar Commodus would alone represent the Antonines on the throne of the world; and history has again and again shown how disciples may pay compliments to a departed master, while they set aside his clearest and most emphatic instructions. And thus the Preacher might seem in one mood of his thought to express the sombre reality—"Then said I in my heart, As it happeneth to the fool so it happeneth even to me; and why was I then more wise? Then I said in my heart that this also is vanity. For there is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool for ever: seeing that which now is in the days to come shall all be forgotten. . . . . Yea! I hated all my labour which I had taken under the sun, because I should leave it unto the man that shall be after me. And who knoweth whether he shall be a wise man or a fool? . . . This also is vanity."*

That, therefore, which must strike us in the words of our Lord is His conscious superiority to the fate which may be commonly expected to befall the influence of a man's character or teaching after death. He had put His life and work into such sort of keeping that it would be unaffected by the varying moods of human minds and the incalculable contingencies of human circumstances. And how would the promised Guardian of Christ's glory set about His work?

First of all, by exerting a transforming, purifying, invigorating influence upon human characters.

No merely natural account can be given of the change which is observable in the Apostles between the eve of the Crucifixion and the morrow of Pentecost. The perplexed, doubting, timid, half-suspicious, gloomy peasants, who misunderstand their Master's words and shrink from His side in the hour of danger, have been transformed into men conscious of being the trustees of a supernatural creed, and more than willing—aye, joyful—at any moment to attest its truth with their lives. And in the great Apostle, whose experience was so different from that of the eleven, a profound transformation of character, as well as of purpose, is no less observable. As he preached the faith which once he destroyed men recognised, he says, a Higher Power that had wrought the change—"They glorified God in me."*

And in after-years, as we know from the genuine Acts of the Martyrs, the Holy Spirit gave glory to the unseen Christ, by displaying again and again before the eyes of the heathen the courage, and patience, and meekness, and dignity of His suffering servants. Nor is it otherwise at the present day. There are lines, well-known to some of you, which describe at least one actual, and probably a not uncommon, experience:—

> "I saw thee once, and naught discerned
> For stranger to admire:
> A serious aspect, but it burned
> With no unearthly fire.
>
> "Again I saw, and I confessed
> Thy speech was rare and high:
> And yet it vexed my burdened heart,
> And scared—I knew not why.
>
> "I saw once more, and awestruck gazed
> On face and form and air;
> God's living glory round thee blazed
> A saint—a saint was there." †

And the glory of our Lord was further promoted when the Holy Spirit organised a visible body—the Christian Church. The Church was not an afterthought, founded by men, who, finding that they thought and felt alike, combined to form an association which could enable them the better to work together, and might secure weight and currency for their convictions. The Church already existed as a home of souls on the day of Pentecost. And for a believer to belong to it was a

* Eccles. ii. 15-19.

* Gal. i. 24 † Lyr. Apost.

matter of necessity, not of propriety or choice. And apart from its faith, its life, its perpetual, scarcely observed, but incessant and resistless expansion, nothing is more wonderful in the early ages than its coherence. It is less remarkable that the Church was not crushed to death by relentless persecutions than that she was not tempted to make terms with the pagan Syncretism which was especially in vogue for instance in the second and third quarters of the third century. From Elagabalus down to Aurelian a constant series of efforts were made to induce the Church to mingle her creed and life with one or another of the conglomerate forms of decaying paganism. So cleverly were the sacraments and rites of Christianity reproduced at one period by the priests of Mithra, that St. Augustine, referring to it, could, almost humorously, exclaim, "Mithra Christianus est." But it was all to no purpose. A few Gnostics might yield to the spell The great Catholic body would have nothing to do with it, though refusal meant a renewal of persecution. The truth was that the business of the Church, informed by the Holy Spirit, was to uphold in undiminished lustre the unshared, unapproachable glory of the Redeemer; and her separate existence witnessed to it in the ratio of the dangers whether of violence or seduction to which she was exposed. The question how she still came to be there could only be answered in the minds of thoughtful men by reference to the unique Person of her Lord. She was there to proclaim His glory.

For this witness of the Church was not that of a voiceless or inert body. She spoke through great saints and writers whose words commanded the attention of the world; she spoke through assemblies which, before the division of East and West, represented, either by delegation or by subsequent consent, the whole of the company to which the promise had been made in the supper-room. Can we fail to see the hand of Providence in this—that before the separations had taken place which suspended the action of the collective Church, every question had been asked and answered that could bear upon the personal glory of the Redeemer; from the truth of His Divinity down to the separate reality of His human Will? In those days of eager speculation, and sincere, if not always instructed belief, there was, indeed, many a wave of unhallowed passion surging round the eternal truths at stake; but the informing, presiding, chastening Spirit rode the storm, and not many a thoughtful man, it may be supposed, who begins by believing that Christ's words are true, can trace the action of the Church in the great Conciliar period without feeling himself in the presence of a Power, the law of Whose action is revealed in the promise—"He shall glorify Me."

Thirdly, and especially, the glorification of the ascended Christ was achieved by the creation of a new sacred literature; the Books of the Canon of the New Testament. The Church is indeed historically older than the New Testament; but the New Testament is the supreme work of the Holy Spirit when glorifying Christ in the Church. Pentecost had not long passed when a group of biographers and letter-writers appeared upon the scene of Christendom, each retaining whatever was characteristic and individual in expression and style, yet so controlled by a unifying and illuminating Power as to combine harmoniously in the setting forth many sides of a single truth. There were, indeed, among the first teachers of the Church minds so divergent by temper and genius, that had all, indeed, depended upon merely human influences, had there been no supernatural bond of unity, they would assuredly have parted into irreconcilable factions. As it is, nothing is more discernible than the controlling and modifying action of God the Holy Spirit in the New Testament writings.

St. Matthew and St. Luke enable us to observe how St. Mark and St. John are only recording differing aspects of a single life: the sermons and discourses reported in the Acts, and the First Epistle of St. Peter, discover the point of unity between the Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians on the one side, and the Epistle of St. James on the other. The Eternal Spirit presides like the leader of a great choir over instruments and voices of the most various compass; and while each contributes something which no other can give, all are duly subordinated to a Single Will, directed to a supreme end. Look through the Apostolic writings and say whether there be any one motive in them so constant or so powerful as the giving His due place and honour in the thoughts and lives of men to our Lord and Saviour. Each Evangelist glorifies one aspect of His life; whether it be His fulfilment of prophecy, or His true Humanity, or His redemptive mission and work, or His pre-existent and Personal Divinity. Each writer of Epistles, or each group of Epistles, sets forth some one truth which shall add to our apprehension of Him; whether it be His example of patience, as in St. Peter, or His lessons of love, as in St. John, or His perfect law of liberty, as in St. James, or His Second Coming, or His justification of the sinner through faith in His Blood, or the transcendent qualities and ordered structure of His mystical Body the Church, as in St. Paul. Whatever else may be divergent in the Apostolic writings, this is the note of their underlying unity of aim: everywhere we trace in them the fulfilment of the promise, "He shall glorify Me."

II. This leads us to consider the method employed by the promised Comforter: "He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you."

Here let us remark that our Lord does not sanction any of those conceptions of the work of the Holy Spirit which treat it as something independent of His own. The Spirit is not the author of a new dispensation: He perpetuates

explains, expands the teaching and work of Jesus Christ: "He shall not speak of Himself," "He shall take of Mine." Therefore is He called, in the Apostolic writings, not only the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of Christ; since it is Christ's mind and teaching—aye, and Christ's renewed human nature, which he conveys to the souls of men.

(*a*) If then we examine the three great departments of the Holy Spirit's work in the inverse order to that followed just now, let us observe first, how He takes of the things of Christ and exhibits them to the Church in the New Testament writings. The first five books of the New Testament are biographical or historical. Popular language often assumes that inspiration must always create; but if this were true there could be no such thing as inspired history. If history be the faithful record of facts, the function of inspiration in history must be limited to the grouping of facts, to the assigning to certain facts a relative prominence. above all to the selection out of a large number of facts of those facts which illustrate a particular aspect of higher truth. Popular language is wont to speak disparagingly of the copyist or the reporter, but the inspiring Spirit did not by any means abhor the work of the reporter or copyist; His inspiration consisted often enough in guidance to select from a large field those materials which would best illustrate the truth He had in view, and to exhibit them in such wise as to secure this object most effectively.

This faculty of judicious selection is higher and rarer than may be at first supposed. To select wisely out of an embarrassingly large assortment of facts and thoughts requires a combination of penetration and resolve, in order to perceive what is really worth preserving, and to resist the seductions of what is not. Without this gift one writer will bury his true purpose beneath a mass of ill-selected and undigested details; while another will not exhibit details sufficient to give his subject the body and outline which he demands. Sometimes books even of high excellence in other respects, and which have laid the world under such great obligations, as, for instance, the "Ecclesiastical History" of Eusebius, may give us reason to regret that their authors have not used more freely certain sources of knowledge which must have been before them, or that they have not touched some matters on which they are discursive with a lighter hand. They may have many merits. But they lack the inspiration of selection.

Now, contrast with this the work of the Holy Spirit in the composition of the Gospels. The supernatural is always haunted by its counterfeit; but the Holy Spirit at once swept aside a mass of legends such as are handed down to us in a somewhat later shape by the New Testament apocryphal literature. Nay more, He took only some of the true words and acts of Christ. Christians might well believe that no acts or words of the Son of God during His earthly life could have been without high import of some kind. But they were not all equally useful for the specific purposes of the several Evangelists. Each Gospel bears traces of being a selection from a larger assortment of materials; the last says expressly that "there are many other things which Jesus did," * and which the Evangelist had not recorded. Each writer having clearly before him that aspect of the life of Jesus which it was his task to illustrate—whether Messianic, or human, or redemptive, or Divine—traverses with this object the stores of his own memory, or the recitals and reports of other eye-witnesses, and records just so much as is needed for his purpose. Each fulfils the prediction—"He shall take of Mine, and shall show it unto you."

The same principle of selection, although it is differently applied, meets us in the Apostolic Epistles. A phrase of Jesus becomes in the hands of an Apostle the warrant of a doctrine, which is thus seen to have been always latent in it. The title "Son of Man," for instance, reappears in St. Paul as the "Second Adam," the ideal Representative of mankind, Whose work is placed in vivid contrast with that of the first father of our race. A word about "giving His life a ransom for many," or "My Blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins," warrants St. Paul and St. John in teaching a propitiatory atonement which wins for sinners pardon and peace. A self-proclamation, not less observable in the Synoptists than in St. John, constantly repeated and so unlimited in its scope that if it were not rendered necessary by the facts of the Speaker's consciousness, it would be fatal to those moral qualities which win the love and respect of men, issues in the great passages of St. Paul on the Divinity of Christ, which thus takes its place as the cardinal truth of the Christian creed. These are but samples of the manner in which the Spirit took of the words of Christ, and showed their full meaning to the Church in the Apostolic Letters.

Nor was this method of selection from and interpretation of existing materials a new procedure of the Spirit in the Apostolic age. He then did what He had done in ages before the Incarnation. As we say in the Creed, He spake by the Prophets; and the Prophets in the sense of the Creed are not only members of the particular order which was endowed with a supernatural faculty for interpreting the Divine will, whether at the passing moment or in the more or less remote future, but also the leading rulers, statesmen, and historians who were entrusted with the guidance of the people of Revelation. And the records of their work, as the authors of the historical books tell us, were largely compiled out of documents already in existence. One historian borrows from another—nay, even one prophet from another; while the

* St. John xxi. 25.

Spirit takes now and again from the conglomerate mass of early traditions or records those fragments which had on them the mint-mark of the Eternal Word, and shows them in a new and inspired combination to His ancient people.

And thus we are led to notice a feature common both to the Old and the New Testaments—the startling presence of what may at first sight appear to be foreign elements in the Sacred Book. The early history of Genesis may suggest traditions which had belonged to ancient pagan peoples living in the great Mesopotamian plain; the original text of its early genealogies may lie buried, as a distinguished Oxford scholar has suggested,* at Kirjath Sepher, or elsewhere, in brick libraries as yet unexamined; the sacred utensils and buildings of Israel, though consecrated to the worship of the Alone Eternal, may have been shaped more or less upon Egyptian models; its later literature may betray affinities—however we explain them—with Persian forms of thought. Nay, the sacred tongue itself, which was selected to be the vehicle of that earlier Revelation, was not, as was once supposed, unique; it was spoken, like Greek, by neighbouring pagans as well, and, as in the Moabite Stone, it sometimes heralded the praise of pagan deities. These and such like facts have been pointed to as showing that the Jewish Revelation did not come from God in any but a merely naturalistic sense. What they really show is that the inspiration which dictated its worship and its sacred records was largely an inspiration of selection.

In like manner the New Testament presents us with facts supplementary to the Old Testament narrative, and often only derived from later Jewish traditions. Such are the prophecy of Enoch; the double call of Abraham from Ur, as from Haran; the hope that sustained Abraham in offering Isaac; the names of the Egyptian magicians; the motive of Moses for leaving the Court of Pharaoh, and Egypt; the exclamation of Moses at Sinai; the rock that followed the Israelites in the desert; the prayer of Elijah for rain.

Again, St. Paul employs Rabbinical arguments and modes of exegesis; and he quotes heathen authors not to refute, but to endorse them.

In instances like these, too, the words are fulfilled, "He shall take of Mine." For the Speaker in the supper-room is none other than the Eternal Word Who is announced in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. "His" are not only the sayings and acts of the Incarnate Christ, but whatever is true in the earlier history and thought of our race. Inspired men, like Melchizedek and Balaam and Job, were discoverable beyond the fence of race with which the Divine Wisdom had guarded His earlier Revelation; and indeed, in all ages, here and there, in the desert wastes of heathendom there are to be met with patches of spiritual beauty; flowers which alike by creation and by culture are His, Who nevertheless ever had in the world only one garden for the human soul, and Who did make Israel His people and Jacob His inheritance, before in the last days He spoke by His Son.

One work of the Holy Spirit is to collect these outlying and—may I say it?—less regular creations of the Divine Mind; it is to disinter the gems that lie hidden beneath the accumulated soil of ages; it is to bring to a focus the rays of light scattered throughout heathendom, and to exhibit their place in the true Self-revelation of God.

For if the Holy Spirit thus selects materials from imperfect or false systems, He does not thereby sanction these systems as a whole, or even imply that those portions of them which He does not employ are after the Mind of God. The quotation from the book of Enoch does not prove that the whole of that composition is inspired. The traces of Egyptian influence in the Mosaic ritual and legislation do not imply wholesale approval of the Egyptian theology. The prologue of St. John does not commit the Apostle of Love to a general sanction of the speculations of Philo. Rabbinical arguments which may be found here and there in St. Paul's Epistles do not mean that all other reasonings current in the Rabbinical schools are valid or even legitimate. An adoption of the particular Jewish tradition about the rock that followed the Israelites in the desert does not commit the Apostle to an approval of all the legendary stories that were already current in the Israel of his day. To quote a line from Epimenides, or Aratus, or Menander did not imply that every fragment of these writers had the sanction of Apostolic authority. The inspiration of selection sanctions that which it selects, and nothing beyond.

(β) There is now unhappily little time for tracing the selective method of the Holy Spirit in the organization and Creeds of the Church. Even if it could be shown that in the Apostolic age the presbyterate was certainly modelled upon Jewish and the Episcopate on Gentile precedents, this would not of itself affect the question of their necessity to the true form and life of the Christian society. But the selective action of the Spirit is especially observable in the Church's use of ancient philosophy. The varying phases of that attitude were determined by the capacity of this or that school to furnish materials that in a given set of circumstances would assist the supreme work of the Spirit among men. In one century Platonism was distrusted, as a solvent dangerous to Christian belief; in another it was laid under contributions by Christian writers, and even furnished terminology to the Catholic creed. Early Fathers may ban Aristotle; yet he is subsequently preferred to Plato, as not venturing upon topics as

* Professor Sayce.

to which nothing can be known certainly without a revelation. The Church is led to reject such a symbol as the Homoousion at one while for reasons which are perfectly compatible with her adoption of it at another. The subject is too large to be more than hinted at. In this field, too, the Spirit is constantly choosing whatever has really come from the Word and Wisdom of the Father and can be, at a given time and place, made serviceable to the interests of His people.

As we follow the Holy Spirit in this department of His work, we may venture without presumption to observe that His action is limited by His own Attributes. He is the Spirit of Truth, not only because it is the truth which He teaches, but also because He Himself is true. Therefore He cannot contradict Himself. If, for instance, He really through the Sixth Council pronounced Honorius to be a heretic, He cannot in our day have pronounced Honorius by implication to be infallible. Nor can he take into His services literary fictions which trifle with the law and the sense of truth. If it could really be shown that the addresses ascribed to Moses in Deuteronomy were the composition of a writer of the age of Josiah, who desired to secure for later legal decisions or institutions the countenance of the great lawgiver; or—that speeches attributed to David in the Book of Chronicles were never uttered by the real David at all, but only represent the opinion of a sacerdotal scribe after the exile as to what David, if properly instructed, would or should have said; or – that passages in Daniel which claim to be predictions of still future events are really a history of events which the writer had himself witnessed, and are thrown into a predictive form, in order to invigorate national enthusiasm at a critical moment by the spectacle of the imaginary fulfilment of a fictitious prophecy; or—that the discourses of our Lord reported by St. John are not the *ipsissima verba* of the same son of Man Who speaks in the Synoptic Gospels, but only the voice of some Christian of the second century, or earlier, whose thought had been steeped in the Platonised Judaism of Alexandria,—or, perhaps, of the Apostle of Love, who, however, could not distinguish clearly between his own and his Divine Master's words; or—that the sermons of St. Peter and St. Paul in the Acts resemble each other too closely to have been really uttered by those Apostles, and only represent a literary effort to produce ecclesiastical harmony in the sub-Apostolic age; or that the pastoral Epistles of St. Paul, although claiming to be his work, were in fact composed when the struggle with Gnosticism had obliged the Church to create a more elaborate organisation, and are largely due to an endeavour to procure for this organisation the sanction of the great Apostle's name:—if, I say, these and other such like theories which might be mentioned could be shown to be based on fact, it surely would be shown at the same time that the Holy Spirit could not have inspired the writings in question. He is not responsible for speeches which cultivated pagans like Thucydides or Tacitus could naturally and without scruple put into the mouths of their heroes. Those great writers had no more the divine law of truth upon their hearts and consciences than they had the divine laws of love or purity; and nothing depends upon the historical worth of those fictitious speeches of theirs beyond the degree and quality of literary entertainment which we at this day may or may not derive from them. It is quite otherwise when we pass within the sacred precincts of the canon of Scripture. If the Holy Spirit is in any degree concerned in the production of its contents we may at least be sure that language is not used in it to create a false impression, and that that which claims, on the face of it, to be history, is not really fiction in an historical guise. The Book of Truth cannot belie either the laws of truth or the Spirit and Source of truth.

(γ) Once more, observe how the Holy Spirit gradually builds up or develops the Christian character. He takes of Christ's teaching and example and shows it in its attractive beauty to the Christian conscience. This work of His is always going forward in those who will. As we pass through life the Holy Spirit, while endowing us through sacramental channels with the new Humanity of the Redeemer, discovers to us more and more the splendour and import of His Person and work. We have learnt, or think that we have learnt, something of truth, and we are suddenly startled at the deeper meanings of the Parable of the Sower. We have succeeded to an estate or we have won academical honours, and we learn the import of the Parable of the Talents. Our thoughts have been led to dwell on the great problems of capital and labour, wealth and poverty, which are so prominent in the modern world, and we see a new significance in the history of Dives and Lazarus, and in the precept given to the rich young man. We have been brought up to measure the worth of men by some class or artificial prejudice, and the position assigned to the Good Samaritan, though we have read about his going down to Jericho all our lives, flashes at a certain moment upon our thoughts as an overwhelming discovery. We have come to suppose that spiritual liberty implies the rejection of all outward authority, and the Holy Spirit reminds us of the words about even the Scribes and Pharisees who sit in Moses' seat. We have wandered, it may be, from the path on which in earlier and happier years our feet had been set to go, and we find guidance and consolation as nowhere else in the story of the Prodigal Son. We are getting on in life, and mapping out, with ambitious confidence, a future which, God perhaps knows, will never be ours; and we are brought to our senses by the record of the man who would

pull down his barns and build greater on the eve of the very night on which his soul was required of him. And all through life, and assuredly not less as life is drawing towards his close, the great doctrines of Redemption and Grace are brought home with new power and clearness to the hearts and consciences of those who will. These are lessons which may make Pentecost a perpetual reality, and bridge over the interval between the most prozaic of lives and companionship with That incomparable Life which was lived nineteen centuries ago on the shores of the Sea of Galilee.

And our Lord's words furnish us with a decisive criterion of the exact worth of dominant influences around us, of currents of thought which, now and again, would sweep us imperiously along with them, of the temper of our own time, of the Zeitgist. It is natural to us to think that the days in which we live are wiser and better than any before, and that in throwing our thoughts without restraint into the main currents of the hour we are doing the best we can with our short span of life. And yet we might observe that many a past generation has cherished this notion of an absolute value attaching to the thought and temper of its day, while we, as we look back on it, with the aid of a larger experience, can see that it was the victim of an illusory enthusiasm. When we analyse the ingredients that go to make up the spirit of the time, of any one phase of time, and when we observe that, notwithstanding its stout assertions of a right to rule, it melts away before our very eyes like the fashions of a lady's dress, into shapes and moods which contradict, with equal self-confidence, its former self, we may hesitate before we listen to it as if it were a prophet, or make a fetish of it, as though it had within it a concealed divinity. The spirit of any generation may have, must have, in it some elements to recommend it; but assuredly it has also other and very different elements, and the question is whence do they come, and whither are they drifting? All that is moving, interesting, exciting in the world of ideas, in the successive conceptions of the meaning and purpose of life that flit across the mental sky, is not necessarily from, nor does it necessarily tend towards, the source of good. The mere movement of the ages does not in itself imply a progress from lower to higher truth, from darkness to light; movement is possible in more directions than one. "Brethren," exclaims an Apostle to some of his flock, to whom every claimant for speculative sympathy seems to have been welcome, "brethren, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits whether they are of God. . . . . Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."*

The test of the true worth of the spirit of our day—of the spirit which rules our own thoughts and lives—is the saying, "He shall glorify Me." All that wins for the Divine Redeemer more room in the thoughts and hearts of men; all that secures for Him the homage of obedient and disciplined wills; all that draws from the teachings of the past and the examples of the present new motives for doing Him the honour which is His eternal due, may be safely presumed to come from a Source higher than any in this passing world, and to have in it the promise of lasting happiness and peace. And, for the rest—

> "Sunt multa fucis illita
> Quae luce purgentur Tuâ,
> Tu vera Lux coelestium
> Vultu sereno illumina."

* 1 St. John iv. 1-3.

It is anounced that, in addition to the consecration of the Bishop-designate of St. Albans, the Archbishop of Canterbury has fixed St. John-the-Baptist's Day for the consecration, at St. Paul's Cathedral, of the Bishops-elect of Bangor and Sydney.

The committee formed in the earlier part of last month for presenting the Bishop of Winchester and Mrs. Harold Browne with some token of the affectionate regard in which they are both held by the clergy and laity of the diocese, on the occasion of their golden wedding anniversary, has since been made more thoroughly representative of the different parts of the diocese, including the Channel Islands, and a sub-committee, consisting of the following, has been appointed to carry out the details:—The Mayor of Winchester, the Bishop of Guildford, Sir Charles Frederick, Sir Augustus Phillimore, the Dean of Winchester, Archdeacons Sapte and Haigh, Canon Warburton, Canon Vernon Musgrave, Mr Melville Portal, Colonel Bouverie-Campbell, Mr. T. Seawell, and Mr. J. C. Moberly, with the Rev. H. Martin as secretary. At the first meeting of the sub-committee the following resolution, afterwards approved by the general committee, was passed:—"That the commemoration should take the form of a contribution to a fund for promoting a diocesan object to be selected by the Bishop, accompanied by a personal gift to his lordship and Mrs Harold Browne." It was decided that contributions to the fund should not exceed one guinea each.

Schinos.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1890.

TEMPERANCE FANATICISM.

A NUMBER of paragraphs like the following are going the round of the newspapers :—

The protest issued by Dr. Norman Kerr against the action of the Committee of the Church of England Temperance Society in regard to the licensing scheme, has been signed by Canons Duckworth, Leigh, Wilberforce and Barker, and Prebendary Grier. It will come to a secession before long if the Committee perseveres in its present line of action.

It is high time that the real advocates of temperance should speak out with no uncertain voice against those who are attempting to degrade and destroy a noble and holy cause, by making it a mere catspaw in the hands of selfish politicians. The present writer is an old teetotaller, attached to the practice of total abstinence by an experience of many years, and zealous to recommend it to others, as the only mode of reclaiming the drunkard, and as the safest and happiest *regimen* for young men to adopt as the habit of their lives. But he cannot shut his eyes to the evident fact that the great obstacle to the advance of temperance is teetotal fanaticism. Looking back over a long past life, in which he has attended and presided over numbers of temperance meetings, and been a member of temperance organisations, he sees clearly that no real progress is being made in temperance reform. The cause of this failure seems to him to be the extravagance, the exaggerations, and in many cases the downright untruthfulness of temperance orators, and the disposition which is shown in many quarters, and now, we grieve to see, amongst influential clergymen, to degrade the movement into a mere instrument in the hands of political demagogues.

Let us take stock of the present position of affairs. The Government have brought forward a very modest measure, in which a fund is provided, by an extra taxation of spirituous liquors, which may hereafter be used by the County Councils in purchasing and extinguishing superfluous public-houses. Mr. Gladstone, who, when he was himself in power, had declared positively and unequivocally that these houses could not justly be put an end to without compensating their owners, sees an opportunity for an attack on his political rivals, and invents the clap-trap phrase that this provision amounts to an "endowment of public-houses." The phrase is taken up by the political wire-pullers, is passed round the country through the political organizations, and reproduced in the form of resolutions by the semi-political temperance societies. Men like Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Henry Labouchere affect a zeal for temperance, which is quite contrary to all their antecedents. And clergymen, like those named in the paragraph which we have extracted, are not ashamed to join in the outcry, and to aid in getting up a Hyde Park meeting to denounce an Act which they cannot themselves deny to be a sincere and well-meant effort for the promotion of temperance.

The Government are willing to insert in their Act such provisions as will make it perfectly clear that the position of the owner or keeper of a public-house is in no way altered, and his claim to compensation in no way enhanced, by anything which their measure contains. But that matters not. The keen eye of political ambition has seen its opportunity, and is determined to make use of it to the uttermost.

Amongst the promoters of this movement there are two classes discernible, the interested parties and the fanatics, the latter used by the former for their own purposes. Now Mr. Gladstone is no fanatic, he is an egotist, pure and simple, who has permitted an ambition, excited to the extreme by frequent failures, and by the close approach of the conclusion of his own career, to over-master in his mind every higher consideration. To displace his rivals, and to regain lost power is all in all to him. And to attain that object he has no scruple about distorting facts, and treading upon the verge of absolute falsehood. Will clergymen of high character permit themselves to be made use of for aims like his?

THE Rev. R. L. Ottley, M.A., of Christ Church, Oxford, has been elected to an official Fellowship as Dean of Divinity in Magdalen, the post rendered vacant by the death of Canon Aubrey Moore. Mr. Ottley entered the University in 1874 as a scholar of Pembroke. He was placed in the first class in the Classical Moderations in 1875, and in the first class in the Final Classical Schools in 1878. He also won the Hertford Scholarship and the Latin Verse Prize in 1876, and the Craven and Derby Scholarships in 1879. In 1878 he was elected Student of Christ Church, and has subsequently been Vice-President of Cuddesdon.

THE TIME OF JACOB'S TROUBLE.

An Inquiry into the Purport of Revelation xii.

By the Rev. RALPH W. HARDEN, B.A.

(*Continued from page* 261.)

Part II.—(*Continued*).

But it would seem that at or before the time of the dragon's banishment to earth, the woman shall have again emerged from obscurity—that is, shall have again asserted her claim as a separate nationality in her ancient home. For she not only excites the wrath of the dragon against herself, but is "given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place" (Rev. xii. 14). Now, if she is to fly into the wilderness whither she is represented as having already fled upon the rapture of her child to God (ver. 6), she must in the meantime have returned from it, in order to make it possible for her to betake herself thither again. And this is exactly the condition which the Jewish nation is assuming in the present day. For centuries, of no account among the peoples of the earth. Shut up in Ghettos and Juden-gasse. Poor and dispirited. Diminished so in numbers that men had begun to feel themselves at liberty to speculate upon the certain and near approach of the extinction of the race. But now, how changed their condition in every particular! The three millions of two centuries ago, to-day little short of ten millions. The people so long despised and oppressed now become virtually the dictators of the Gentiles, a mysterious dread superadded to the ancient hatred of the race. A few more revolutions of the wheel of time, one or two political convulsions, and the world may witness the realization of a poet's dream,* and a nation's aspiration—Israel, a resuscitated nation in their own land; recognized among the nations of the world, in the wilderness no more.†

(3.) Having thus endeavoured to establish the identity of the woman with the Jewish nation, we may now proceed in the last place to inquire, who are "the rest (or remnant) of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. xii. 17, R.V.).

This *remnant* is a class to which special prominence is given by the Holy Spirit in all the predictions which concern the fortunes of Israel in the latter days. From none of them in fact is it entirely absent. Thus *Isaiah* when picturing the final glory of Palestine foretells its position by "the remnant of Israel." "The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God. For though thy people Israel be as the sand of the sea, yet a remnant of them shall return." "It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of His people which shall be left" (Isa. x. 20, 21, 22; xi. 11). So also *Jeremiah* describing the kingdom of the Righteous Branch, announces Jehovah's intention: "I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them" (Jer. xxiii. 3). And when *Joel* declares the signs of the "great and terrible day of the Lord," he adds the promise, "In mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call" (Joel ii. 32). And *Amos*, referring to the same event, exhorts to repentance upon this ground. "It may be that the Lord God of Hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph" (Amos v. 15 with 3). I have already drawn attention to the close coincidence between *Micah's* prophecy and the vision of St. John. And singularly enough it is in this same book we have the most frequent mention of the *remnant*. The passages are too numerous for quotation, but they should be consulted. They are Micah ii. 12, iv. 7, v. 3,* 7, 8; vii. 18. In the short prophecy of *Zephaniah* we find no less than three occurrences of the word (ii. 7, 9; iii. 12, 13): the last being conspicuously striking from its position in a description of Jehovah's wrath against the Gentiles, "I will also leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord. The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth; for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid." And lastly, in *Zechariah's* description of Israel's restoration, the promised blessing is foretold as belonging to the remnant. "I will cause the remnant of this people to possess all these things."—(Zech. viii. 12.)

I have given these citations at length, both because they all relate unquestionably to the Israel of the last days, and also because they illustrate the emphasis which the Holy Spirit lays upon the *remnant* of the nation at that time. Now if the woman of Rev. xii. be the Jewish nation, as I have attempted to show, it is most natural to suppose that "the remnant of her

* See "Daniel Deronda" (B. vi. chap. xlii.), by George Eliot.

† I cannot refrain from quoting (from the *Jewish Chronicle*, August 31st, 1888) an extract from an interview with an American Jewish Rabbi, the Rev. H. P. Mendes, on the Restoration, recently published in the *New York Herald*. "Every day brings us nearer. Long years doubtless have to pass first. Even centuries, perhaps. At any rate, events at this moment seem to indicate that only decades and not centuries are destined to slide away before our restoration becomes a fact. Notice the strained attention at times in connection with the Eastern question (often enough it is brought up.) Rational common sense has already suggested that the only way to calm the jealousies of the Great Powers as to Syria, which all of them want, is to make it a neutral State. Then give it in charge of the Jews, who are peaceful and able to develop business possibilities. Of course this is feasible. Besides, it would accord with the Bible promise, Isaiah xlix. 22. I do not mean to say this is an established idea. All I know is that nothing would surprise us. Such international co-operation would be nothing new. But do not let it be imagined for one moment, that our possession of Palestine is desired by us simply because it gives us a national home. We desire it simply on account of what things it involves. To briefly state these I would say—First the establishment of a respected court of arbitration for the settlement of international and such like disputes, thus causing war to cease (Is. ii. 4); second, an evidencing of a religionising religion, if I may coin a phrase. I mean a religion which shall not be a conventionality, so that no more shall we see how these Christians do not love one another, or how orthodox Jews are oft most unorthodox, and reform Jews sadly need reforming. *Verbum sap.* For the expectation of a better moral tone in the world see Is. xi. 10, or Jer. xxxi. 34. In short, to sum up what we mean by our restoration to Palestine, we mean the institution of universal peace and universal brotherhood. Universal happiness must naturally follow. This will be, not simply a consolation for the Jews, or the consolation of Zion, so long bereaved of her children. It will be the consolation of the world after all the sobbing and shrieking which history's page records of each and every nation."

Those who are disposed to smile at all this as fanciful speculation should remember that in 1887 the export from Jerusalem of manufactured olive-wood and mother of pearl alone amounted to £20,000.

* יֶתֶר אֶחָיו yether ĕchaiv.

seed," with whom the dragon is to make war, is the same Jewish remnant so uniformly spoken of by all the prophets of the Old Testament as reserved by God for blessing in the midst of the nation's last and greatest affliction. While the newly developed Jewish nationality is opposed and crushed by the combined force of beast and false prophet; while the kingdom, temporarily revived under Gentile influences, disappears again—"where she hath a place prepared of God"—till God, her own God, shall bring His Israel from her hiding place, and make her an everlasting dominion, this remnant of Jews, the seed of the nation remains to be cast into the furnace of affliction. This, I think, preserves a natural and intelligible distinction which is altogether lost and impossible if the woman be the Church.

But the inspired revelation preserves some features by which we may still further distinguish this remnant. They "keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. xii. 17. R. V.).

As to the first of these marks there can be no difficulty. The Scriptures which speak of the remnant of Israel in the latter days, also characterise it as obedient and faithful to Jehovah in the midst of surrounding apostasy. The prophecy of Zephaniah, quoted above (iii. 12, 13), is a remarkable instance of this. But it is the prophet who details most fully the sorrows of these days, who calls special attention to the fidelity of the remnant. It is Daniel, who particularises the men who "forsake the holy covenant," who "do wickedly against the covenant," whom the king shall "corrupt (R. V. *pervert*, marg. Heb. *make profane*) by flatteries" (Dan. xi. 30, 32), who also tells us—that "some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white" (Dan. xi. 35)—that "the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits" (ver. 32); and —that "they that be wise (marg. *teachers*) shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." (xii. 3.)

And these I suppose to be "the saints," whom Daniel mentions (vii. 21) as being oppressed by the Little Horn: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."* They are also "the elect," referred to by our Lord in His discourse upon the Mount of Olives, for whose sake the days of the tribulation "shall be shortened" (Matt. xxiv. 22, and also 24). The term is apparently that used by Isaiah seven hundred years before, of the same people and in the same connection (Isa. lxv. 9, 15, 22). And lastly, they are the *sealed* of the twelve tribes (Rev. vii. 1-8), the "hundred and forty and four thousand which were redeemed from the earth," which "follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth" (Rev. xiv. 1, 3, 4).

The other characteristic mark of the *remnant*—that they "hold the testimony of Jesus"—demands a closer examination, as it may be supposed to present a very serious difficulty. If this remnant be Jews, and they obviously not "the remnant according to the election of grace" (Rom. xi. 5), that is to say, not those gathered into the Church of Christ by the preaching of the Word, during this dispensation of the Gospel—how then can they be said to *hold the testimony of Jesus*, if as yet they neither know nor believe in Him as the Messiah? This is a fair objection to the theory I have been supporting, which maintains the *remnant* to be Jews, and ought therefore to be fairly met and disposed of. We must, therefore, pause a little to examine carefully the meaning of the words.

And first of all we need to make a sharp distinction between the two expressions, *testifying to* or *witnessing for Jesus*, and *holding the testimony of Jesus*. For the two are by no means identical, although in this Book of Revelation they are commonly held to be so. To testify to, however, or witness for a person is an act done for or on behalf of that person by the party testifying. On the other hand, to have or hold the testimony of anyone implies that the person whose testimony you have is actually bearing witness to you rather than you testifying for him. To take a case in point. St. Paul writes of the qualifications of a bishop, "He must have (ἔχειν) good testimony from them that are without" (1 Tim. iii. 7); and we see at once that it is the outsiders, whose good report he possesses, who testify to him and not he to them. Or, to take another instance more strictly parallel, St. John declares, "He that believeth on the Son of God hath (ἔχει) the witness in himself" (1 Jno. v. 10.) No one supposes that the Apostle here speaks of any testimony which the believer bears to Christ. It is rather the witness which Christ bears to him—the inward consciousness of Christ's peace and forgiveness which it is the believer's privilege to possess. There is another passage yet where we find the expression *to have the witness*, and where it is evident that the person who possesses the testimony is borne witness to, and not that he himself testifies. It is the word of our Lord concerning Himself: "The witness which I have (ἔχω) is greater than that of John; for the works which the Father hath given Me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of Me, that the the Father hath sent Me." (Jno. v. 36.)

Now, if in these three places—the only ones, beside those of the Apocalypse, where *to have* or *hold the testimony* is found—the phrase implies that the testimony is possessed, not given, by the person holding it, is it justifiable to reverse this common sense meaning in the three places where it occurs in the Revelation (vi. 9, xii. 17, and xix. 10), and say that the remnant who hold the testimony of Jesus are they who *testify about Jesus?* For myself, I confess I can see neither reason nor necessity to depart from the ordinary meaning of the phrase, and I therefore interpret it in the Apocalypse, as elsewhere in the New Testament, of those who possess, hold fast, cling to "the testimony of Jesus."*

(*To be continued.*)

THE Bishop of Sodor and Man has abandoned the intention of taking a voyage to Canada, his medical adviser deeming it to be unnecessary.

A MOVEMENT is being promoted for the purpose of presenting the Bishop of Lincoln with a set of altar frontals, for use in his private chapel. The gift is primarily intended as an offering from those who have been confirmed by his lordship, but many others are joining.

* Tregelles interprets these *saints* to be the Church (*On Daniel*, page 47). But Todd and Maitland, more Scripturally, as I think, hold them to be the Jewish remnant of the last days, See Dr. J. H. Todd, *On the Antichrist*, pages 159-161.

* Besides, if it had been intended that we should understand this as *testifying* in the ordinary sense of the word, should we not have had that word (μαρτυρέω), as it occurs in this very book, i. 2, xxii. 16, 20?

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." June, 1890. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

WE have seldom read a pleasanter paper than that by Canon Hicks on "Demetrius, the Silversmith." The riot at Ephesus, when St. Paul nearly lost his life, is one of the most life-like pictures in the Acts, even without any extraneous help, but the light which recent discoveries at Ephesus have thrown upon it make it clearer still. Canon Hicks shows that the riot was no unexpected impulse, but in all probability a preconcerted measure; he shows also that there is some probability that Demetrius was chairman of the Guild of Silversmiths. Whether the conjectural reading of the 24th verse is correct or not, we will not give an opinion, but it is extremely ingenious and well deserves consideration.

Dr. Plummer's "Recollections of Dr. Döllinger" are very interesting, but we confess to setting most weight on his praise of Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church." On the "Disestablishment of the Church," on "Mr. Gladstone's Policy," etc., etc., he speaks as an outsider and we are interested, but nothing more. His reason against Disestablishment is curious; Continental nations would think we had *therefore* renounced Christianity. If Continental opinion is so superficial as that, we may safely disregard it.

Dr. Rawson Lumby contributes nothing new in his paper on the "Book of Proverbs"; indeed, it reads like notes for a lecture to passmen in Divinity.

Dr. Bruce continues his "Commentary on the Hebrews"; the last of the five articles is one by Count Baudissin on the late Professor Delitzsch.

"THE SERMON BIBLE." Vol. V. S. Matthew i-xxi. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE editor of this most useful series tells us in a prefatory note that increased use has been made in this volume of manuscript sources, and that the range of authors quoted is widened. We think none can complain of favouritism by the editor, for all schools of thought are laid under contribution. And the extent of choice is of the widest; for instance, there are twenty-eight sermons on the Temptation and thirty-eight on the Lord's Prayer; there is even one on the word Amen, taken from A. Saphir's "Lectures on the Lord's Prayer." Even foreign preachers are laid under contribution—Rothe, Tholuck, and others. Altogether, as far as we have examined it, this volume shows no falling off from the usefulness of its predecessors.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SISTERHOODS IN IRELAND.—AN APPEAL TO ENGLAND.

SIR,—You in England are used to these appeals; and they are never neglected. But I should warn you to weigh them well. Such an appeal is made in the *Church Times* for this week. £2,000 is asked of you to enable one of your clergy to build a house for a School and a Sisterhood close to St. Bartholomew's Church. The writer says "some of us," since Disestablishment, "have done our part to maintain Church doctrine and worship." But here is the point. What does the writer mean by "Church doctrine and worship?" He says, in the present school, which he means to enlarge, there are 20 children. What are they taught? Is it to go as close to Romanism as possible without violating the law? There is an art by which a man may safely elevate the Cup and Paten, and yet pretend that he is not elevating at all. There is an art, by which a man may adore a corporal presence on the altar, and yet pretend that he only bows to the East, which pretence the *Church Times* for this week scoffs at as utterly absurd. What we want to know is, whether the children are taught these arts of measurement, according to which a child may safely know how far she may put out her tongue at her teacher with impunity. We would also like to know about auricular confession, whether it is represented as a dangerous anodyne, according to the Archbishop of Dublin, or, on the contrary, whether, in defiance of the English Bishops at Lambeth, the practice of habitual confession to a priest is encouraged, and the being subject to the direction of a priest is made a condition of attaining to the higher spiritual life. So much for the children. We want to know what are the "Church doctrine and worship" in which they are trained. I now turn to the other part of the question, the sisterhood, who are, I suppose, to live together in this proposed new Community House. Single ladies, or gentlemen, may very well live together, as long as they are so disposed. It is so amongst the Moravians. But we hear of vows in these new Sisterhoods—Obedience, Poverty, and Celibacy. The main question is, Are these vows only for the present, or are they to bind for ever? I will take obedience first. If this obedience is to be without question or demur, as when one had to make the sign of the Cross with her tongue on the floor at the Mother Abess's feet, I ask may one get rid of it by going away, or is one bound for life? The second vow is poverty. Is one to make over all she has for ever, so that if she can escape at all, it will be as a pauper? Or is the Community to have the interest of her money, only as long as she stays, the capital being her own? The third vow is celibacy. Is this for a few years, or is it for life? It would not be of much consequence, if St. Paul's rule of "threescore" years were acted on. But to allow young girls or women to bind themselves for life would be laying a burden upon them, which neither our fathers before the Reformation, nor Romish priests, monks or nuns, can bear now, without evils, too terrible to be contemplated much less expressed. The reverend writer tells you in England that his plan has the Archbishop's sanction. We all know how much disposed his Grace is to put the best interpretation on every one's acts and plans. But there must be a limit. He visits Spain and Portugal. He must know what evils attend monasteries, nunneries, and the celibacy of the clergy in those countries. He is labouring to free Spain and Portugal from this system. It is not to be conceived that nunneries and monasteries, too bad for Spain, etc., are, in his eyes, good enough for us. He cannot sanction houses ruled by perpetual vows. Let all this be cleared up. If the plan is like that of the Moravians only to last

so long as both parties choose, well and good! But if obedience, poverty and celibacy are for life, we in Ireland will have none of it; and we pray you in England not to give a penny of your money to a system, which is Roman in its worst features, though cloaked over by the transparent veil of "Church doctrine and worship."

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE.
Can. and V.-G. of Kildare.

P.S.—How hard the *Church Times* finds it to make out any defence for vows of perpetual celibacy is plain when she compares such unnatural compacts with ordination and matrimonial vows. A cause must be bad indeed that has to resort to such absurd likenesses, where there is no analogy at all.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—I should have been glad to have had an opportunity of revising my letter in the last number of the PULPIT. Several corrections should be made. Page 262, left column, last paragraph, should read: "They (*i.e.*, plants and animals) can only vary within definite limits—the limits of their own species, and only in obedience to the law of the Creator: 'Thus far shalt thou come and no farther.' Lower down, the question should read: "And why the strict command in Lev. xix. 19, which occurs in the midst of warnings against those 'abominable customs' 'which defiled the land?'"

Page 263, left column, first paragraph, the words with reference to Mr. Thring should be: "For 35 years—more than a generation—he presided over one of the foremost public schools in this country, and with pre-eminent success (notably at one great crisis), who sees more, etc."

Lower down, the reference to Carlyle should be: "What has he to say about evolution as the true clue to the secret of the universe? It is all summed up in his words: 'Deluded Insanity.'"

The opinion of these great men seems fully justified when Science, in the person of one of its chief representatives, pronounces Darwin's boasted theory to be "The Law of Higgledy Piggledy."

H. HEBER EVANS.

June 3, 1890.

SIR,—In troubling you with another letter, I only wish to say that my former one was written, not with any hope of convincing an anti-evolutionist; that I know to be well nigh impossible; but to draw out Mr. Evans to reply, for I wanted to discover if he had any fresh arguments other than those advanced a quarter of a century ago. I regret to find he has none. He falls back, *e.g.*, upon the old, old statement that hybrids are barren. Some are, but *hundreds are not*. The quotation from Shakespeare has done duty before, but Mr. Evans cannot see that it is quite beside the question. Moreover, no evolutionist ever supposed that man's genealogy had anything whatever to do with baboons, or apes of any kind. Once more, if plants cannot vary "indefinitely," will Mr. Evans undertake to "define" the limits of their variation? etc., etc., etc.

GEORGE HENSLOW.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkins, Rev. Horace John, Rector of Harrington, Northamptonshire.

Atkinson, Rev. Walter Chetwynd, M.A., Curate of Winkfield; Senior Curate of Bury, Lancashire.

Bateman, Rev. Gregory Climenson, Chaplain of St. James's, Okehampton.

Bickersteth, Rev. Henry Venn, B.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

Boggis, Rev. Robert James Edmund, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

Broughton, Rev. J. R., B.A., Senior Curate of Edgbaston; Rector of Oake, Somersetshire.

Clarker, Rev. F. J., Chaplain, Bengal (Calcutta).

Cohu, Rev. John Rougier, M.A., Rector of Remenham, Berks.

Cronshaw, Rev. Herbert Priestley, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

Davenport, Rev. G. D., M.A., Assistant Missioner for the Diocese of Exeter.

Edwards, Rev. John, Vicar of Stretton-with-Wetmore, Burton-on-Trent.

Fletcher, Rev. J. A., Vicar of Bungay, Suffolk.

Fullerton, Rev. Samuel Hewitt, B.A., Chaplain of Plymouth Harbour.

Green, Rev. A. V., M.A., LL.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, Geelong, Victoria; Vicar of Christchurch Pro-Cathedral, Ballarat, and Archdeacon of Ballarat.

Heygate, Rev. William Augustine, M.A., Vicar of Leigh, Dorset; Vicar of Burbage, Wilts.

Jeffcock, Rev. J. T., M.A., Rector and Rural Dean of Wolverhampton; Prebendary of Dassett Parva in Lichfield Cathedral.

McCheane, Rev. R., Chaplaln at Ostend.

Murphy, Rev. C. H., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces at Aldershot; Principal Chaplain at Portsmouth.

Ottley, Rev. H. B., M.A., Rector of West Hackney; Vicar of Eastbourne.

Sanctuary, Rev. Charles Lloyd, M.A., Rector of North Poorton, Dorset.

Seaman, Rev. C. E., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Northwood, I.W.; Surrogate for the Diocese of Winchester.

Smythe, Rev. Patrick Murray, M.A., Rector of Rockingham; Vicar of Westbury, Wilts.

Sowter, Rev. G. A., M.A., Chaplain to the Missions to Seamen, Bristol Harbour; Vicar of St. Silas's, Bristol.

Thistle, Rev. T., M.A., Head Master of Hereford Grammar School.

Walker, Rev. Cyril, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Appledram, Sussex.

Waltham, Rev. Richard, M.A., Rector of Glaston, Rutland.

Whiteley, Rev. James, M.A., Curate of West Bromwich; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Willenhall.

Woodward, Rev. H. H., M.A., Precenter of Worcester Cathedral; Surrogate of the Diocese of Worcester.

Wordsworth, Rev. Christopher, M.A., Perpetual Curate of East Holme, Dorset.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Brown, Rev. H. V., at High Wycombe, on the 17th ult., aged 37.

Gatty, Rev. Robert Henry, at the Manor House, Buckden, on the 29th ult., aged 61.

Hooker, Rev. William, Vicar of Stodmarsh, at the Jewell House, Marden, on the 13th ult., aged 80.

Howard, Rev. Richard Henry, of Wygfair, St. Asaph, and Lower Soughton, Flint, on the 31st ult., aged 76.

Lloyd-Greame, Rev. Yarburgh Gamaliel, at Sewerby House, East Yorkshire, on the 30th ult., aged 76.

Sharpe, Rev. J. W., at Northleach, suddenly, on the 29th ult., fourteen years Vicar of the parish, aged 64.

The Church of England Pulpit.

LIFE IN NATURE AND IN CHRIST.

By the Rev. W. DONE BUSHELL, M.A., Assistant-Master in Harrow School.

Sermon Preached in the Parish Church of Felixstowe, on Easter Sunday, 1890.

"He is risen: He is not here."—St. Mark xvi. 6.

IT is a voice from the empty tomb. "He is risen, He is not here." And on the fact these words express depend the hope, the consolation, nay, the very immortality of man! For if Christ our Master has not conquered death, then who may conquer it? Our faith is vain. Therefore it is that words like these, "He is risen, He is not here," thrill as no other words have power to thrill the heart of Christendom to-day. We do not *tell* the message to each other as men do in Eastern lands, as Russian soldiers did upon the Flag-staff Bastion at Sebastopol whilst British shells were whistling past their ears. Our habits are too self-restrained. And yet what a joy it is to wake this morning after the long watch of Lent, and the sad vigil of the Holy week, what joy at least to those who have thus followed Jesus in His Passion, and who have listened by the Cross to His sevenfold words of dying love, what joy to wake up and to feel with more assurance it may well be than on any other day that immortality is not a dream, a splendid unsubstantial vision, but is revealed and guaranteed to us in Him Who as on this day conquered death, in Him of Whom the voice speaks from the empty tomb, "He is risen, He is not here."

Risen; the life of ministry is over now; *risen*, the death of Calvary is swallowed up in victory; *risen*, no more the sleepless nights, no more the sweat drops of Gethsemane, no more the "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani" of the Cross; yes, *risen*, and risen with Him the trembling hopes of our humanity; He is risen, and in His rising brings with Him a guarantee of victory, the power of a new life for all His Church.

Pause we for a moment in our Easter joy, those of us at least who have an Easter joy, to recognise the vital change which has thus come upon the hopes of the human race; to recognise how that dark heathen dread of the underworld, the land of shadows, a dread so real that the life of a dog on earth seemed more to be desired than that of an Achilles or a Hector in the dark realms below, has passed away from Christian men for ever; to recognise how changed from what we find in even the Old Testament is what we are now bold to assert of immortality. For what was said by them of the old time? They spoke with trembling lip and bated breath of death; they had but little to say of life beyond the grave. No doubt there are great central passages which give expression to man's ineradicable hopes, as when we are told that "God will swallow up death in victory," but with what sadness do we recall to-day such words as these: "The dead praise not Thee, O Lord, neither all they that go down into silence," or again, "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest"!

We know, of course, the explanation. It is because the Bible is the record of a gradual training, giving as it does as much as those for whom it was written could understand and bear, that and no more; it is because the slow development of revelation is as the slow growth of the giant tree, the almost infinitely slow formation of the solid land on which long ages afterwards shall rise up Christian homes and Christian fanes of prayer. But though we understand why this is so, yet does the fact remain. And that it is so shows what a revolution was effected in the hopes of men when on this day they learnt to trust in One Who as they believed had conquered death, Who had been bold to say, and with a boldness amply justified, "I am the Resurrection and the Life;" and now could say, "I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore."

For what does such a trust involve? Two things at least, our hope of immortality in Him, and further, an assurance that the world is not deserted by its true King. And O my brethren what a power is that! Christ is behind the vail! Each little effort after good is therefore the expression of an eternal goodness which is there, each life which in any sense is rightly lived is lived in union, be it more or less complete, with an ascended and eternal life in heaven; each death which in any sense is rightly died does but make that inseparable union more complete.

This is the Easter faith; the Lord is risen indeed; no faith so happy, none so full of power; a faith in which a man may face life, sorrow, death, all joyously and valiantly, strong in his trust that "whether he live, he lives unto the Lord, or whether he die, he dies unto the Lord, so that living or dying he is the Lord's."

And now bear with me whilst we consider briefly what is the sort of life, the Christ-life, which is thus victor over death by its inherent power. It is the life of self-surrender, it is the life of love which has been crowned. Yes, it is not the natural life, it is the supernatural life of grace which has been thus approved with power; it is the maimed scarred body with the nail prints and the spear print which has been raised from death to be set down for ever at the right hand o God.

Let me endeavour to expand this thought. There is a revelation in the natural world: there is a higher revelation which has come to us in Jesus Christ; the one bears witness to the excellence of strength, of order, and of beauty, the other to the excellence of love. And what I say is that it is the latter not the former which to-day has conquered death and has been sealed with the Divine approval.

The natural world may teach us much, but it is full of selfishness and cruelty. Life preys on life. And there is one consideration which now-a-days oppresses us as it did not perhaps oppress with like disquietude a former generation. It is not only that the world apart from Christ is cruel and self-seeking, but there is this. Few of us now believe that life came into the world but a few thousand years ago. One of God's revelations to this nineteenth century is that age succeeded age, millennium to millennium, and all the while an awful struggle for existence was the first law of life. It is a terrifying thought. Age after age new forms of life usurp the place of the old which pass away, and why? Because they are liker God? Nay, but because the race is to the swift, the battle to the strong, because in that fierce struggle for existence there is no pity, no remorse; it is resistless as the glacier's flow which grinds to powder all that would withstand its onward way. It is the stronger race prevails, but who may dare to say it is the nobler? And what of the weaker, those who are pushed aside to die, those to whom the law of natural selection means a law of speedy and inevitable death? Small comfort I suppose for them, small comfort for the mouse as he lies trembling in her claws to recognise the beauty of the cat, the vigour and the swiftness of her spring; small comfort for the Red Indian, the Maori, the Polynesian Islander to recognise that he must pass away that the white man may live. But so it has been for a thousand, thousand generations: yes, and outside the Church of Christ so is it now, the race is to the swift the battle to the strong, and Nature, spite of all her higher teachings, "red in tooth and claw with ravine" shrieks against the creed that God is love.

But on this day how is it? Upon this day a higher law is recognised and is victorious in Jesus Christ. What did He represent? Not strength, but weakness, not destruction but long suffering, not selfishness but self-surrender. And it is this life, not the old animal and savage life, which has on this day risen from the dead to be set down at the right hand of God in power. From this day forward "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." It is a mode of life clean contrary to that fierce struggle for supremacy, it is the Divine life of unselfishness which is revealed on Calvary and raised again on Easter day.

What then? What follows? Why this, that God, with Whom is power, is after all upon the weaker side. What though each age be crimsoned with the life blood of the weaker race, yet after all such is not the eternal Father's final law. Age after age the stronger preys upon the weaker and the weaker perishes, yet all the time in His eternal purposes the Lamb is slain and raised again from the foundation of the world. Men well might shrink in terror as they regarded the remorseless evolution of the natural world, so pitiless, so bloodstained, and so cruel, did they not recognise God's higher law of love now manifest on Calvary, and on this Easter morning sealed with the seal of victory. Who at the last bears off the palm? To whom do the eternal gates lift up their heads? Who is the conqueror? Our answer is, our Christian faith, that victory is given at last, not to some mammoth or leviathan, more pitiless, more strong, more fierce than any which has lived before; not so; His is the victory Who being in the form of God grasped not at His equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of man; His Who was not the outcome of a survival law at all, but Who being found in fashion as a man humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death; His Whom God, therefore, highly exalted, giving Him the name that is above every name, that in the name, not of brute strength, or skill, or swiftness, but in the name of Jesus the self-emptying, Jesus the loving, Jesus the crucified, each knee should bow of things in Heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue should confess that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

> "O sacred Head, surrounded
> By crown of piercing thorn;
> O bleeding Head, so wounded
> Reviled and put to scorn;
> Death's pallid hue comes o'er Thee,
> The glow of life decays;
> Yet angel hosts adore Thee,
> And tremble as they gaze."

Yes, on this day a new created world springs forth at God's command; it is the Catholic Church whose corner-stone is love. The Church, for by the Church it is the irreconcilable antagonism is now proclaimed; the challenge is thrown down; the worldly principle of self-enrichment is confronted by the opposing principle of Christian charity. She claims that she is here to give, and not to get; and if we will not give, give of our best, we are not her true members; she claims that she is here to serve and not to rule, and if we will not serve we are not of her. This is her claim, and in the light of Easter and Ascension tide she claims that, spite of ages of unceasing massacre, it is to love and self-denial the victory has been assured. She claims, in words which I have already used, that on this day the nail-print in the sacred limbs, the spear-print in the sacred side were raised and glorified, that so the law of love incarnate in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, was stamped with the Divine approval, to be set down for ever at the right hand of power.

Forgive me, brethren, if these thoughts seem difficult. Perhaps they are: and yet we cannot

fail to see how practical is the antagonism which they involve. The two antagonistic principles of self-enrichment and of love meet us at every turn, the one the world-old law of selfishness, the other the law of the Church of Jesus Christ. And we, each one of us, must each day choose between them to our eternal profit, or our eternal loss. Which then shall we choose, the world-life or the Christ-life, giving or getting, Heaven or Hell? "Child of the Cross, child of the Resurrection, child of My Body broken and My Blood poured forth"; it is the Saviour's voice, "which will you have? Will you in your turn accept the life of self-surrender and go down into the tomb that you may share My Easter victory"? Yes, go down into the tomb, for die we must, so much is certain, if we will rise with Him; die to our sin, die to our selfishness; for death, and death alone is the gate of life. Can we accept the stern condition?

"He that will come after Me, let Him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me."

But, again: "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

And how to reconcile this seeming contradiction, Rest and the Cross? Brethren, it is no contradiction, or if a contradiction it remains the deepest truth of Christianity. It is because the Cross unites man's will with the eternal will of God, that therefore the Cross prevails, and that the death to sin is the inseparable condition of the new and Easter life.

VENTURES FOR GOD.

By the Rev. J. A. CARR, LL.D., Vicar of Whitechurch, Co. Dublin.

Sermon Preached in Whitechurch Church, on behalf of the Diocesan Board of Religious Education, on Sunday, April 27th, 1890.

"Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days."—Eccles. xi. 1.

THIS is one of those rich proverbial sayings which we find scattered through this strange and difficult book of Ecclesiastes. It bears on its face a capacity for many interpretations. It may be that the writer had in his mind at the moment the picture of a scene oftentimes realized in the East, when after the rainfall, or the subsiding of a flood on the river's banks, a sower will go forth casting the precious seed on the thin sheet of water which still remains. He does so in hope. He knows that those waters are the secret source of future fruitfulness; he knows that the seed he scatters thereon is all the more likely to germinate and fructify, and so he goes forth casting his bread upon the waters in the firm belief that he shall find it after many days. Or it may be that in the words we have an encouragement to generosity and beneficence. In Eastern countries the loaf consists of a thin-baked cake which lightly floats upon the water like a chip of wood. The thought then is this—give thy bread to the poor; let it float down the stream of thy goodness and benevolence; thou shalt find it—after many days find it—in the blessings and prayers of those whom thou hast relieved in the hour of their necessity. Do good, cast thy bread upon the waters: thou shalt be repaid for it one day or another. We are reminded of the words of the prophet—"If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry and satisfy the afflicted soul, then shall thy light rise in obscurity and thy darkness be as the noon-day. And the Lord shall guide thee continually and satisfy thy soul in drought and make fat thy bones, and thou shalt be like a watered garden and like a spring of water whose waters fail not." Or we may quote our Lord's words: "give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again." If curses come home to roost, as the saying is, much more may it be said that blessings thus come home to roost.

There is a third way of regarding this sententious text. Let us suppose it to be illustrated by the principles of trade and commerce. They who send forth ships and "do business in great waters," such persons in a certain sense are carrying out the principle that underlies these words. In their goings forth, in their great mercantile transactions, in their ventures and speculations, they are casting their bread upon the waters, they are sinking a certain amount of capital in some bold stroke of business; but they are doing this in faith and expectancy, not blindly nor rashly, but with consideration and in the firm hope that they shall reap the result of their great transactions some day in assured success. Coming from the pen of the great merchant-king who had at sea a navy of Tarshish, and who traded in gold, and silver, and ivory, and apes, and peacocks, we can understand the point and force of these words—"Cast thy bread upon the waters, for thou shalt find it after many days:" commit thy wealth to the sea, make bold ventures, thou shalt reap a golden harvest in successful enterprise; or it may express more particularly the nature of the extensive business carried on in corn, in those days as well as now, the vessels laden with their cargoes of wheat literally exemplifying the bread cast upon the waters, and the successful transactions in the corn market, the finding of it after many days.

These words thus from a secular point of view illustrate for us those principles on which the great business transactions of the world are carried on which are courage, forethought, prudence, patience, faith, and hope.

Now I need hardly remind you how frequently in Holy Scripture the things of this life are employed

to illustrate and set forth the things which belong to the life to come. This is a special feature in our Lord's teaching. Take for example the two well-known parables, that of the Unjust Steward, and that of the Pounds or Talents. They both have the same end in view—to show us how we ought to apply the principles that regulate our interest in worldly matters to the higher interests which belong to the unseen and eternal world.

The unjust steward was a worldly-wise man. He secured the goodwill of his lord's debtors beforehand in order that when he lost his situation they might befriend him by receiving him into their houses. And our Lord's comment on the parable is this—I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail—they, that is to say, those to whom ye have been kind, who have benefited by your charities and friendly assistance—may be at hand to give you a welcome into everlasting habitations. And the parable of the pounds is equally clear as to the necessity of making the best possible use we can of the talents and advantages committed to us here, be they what they may, means, position, education, or any other gift entrusted to our stewardship. These things are given to us to trade with for spiritual ends, that at His coming our blessed Lord may receive His "own with usury." I do not think any of us consider this enough, or keep it in mind as we should, that we must one day give an account of how we have employed the talents and opportunities for doing good, and benefiting our fellow-creatures entrusted to us here by God. If we did so we would be more careful to cast our bread upon the waters so as to gain the reward and find it after many days—the sweetest and most blessed of all rewards in the smile and approval of our dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

But while these words thus imply a resemblance between earthly and heavenly transactions, a laying out for worldly and temporal advantages, and a laying out for spiritual and eternal rewards, they also suggest a contrast. The best laid worldly schemes may fail, there may be a panic on the market, the speculator may buy for the rise and have to face a fall, the ships may be wrecked and the cargoes lost; but so it cannot be in the case of those who are seeking amid the transactions and anxieties of life to lay up for themselves some treasures in that heavenly world "where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal." Dear brethren, try and remember this, take to heart our Lord's words, see how He impresses upon us all the necessity, if we would be His true followers, of denying ourselves for His sake; how He asks for practical, not mere theoretical Christianity; and how He evermore, in the face of the danger of the taunt that our religion is based on selfishness, points to the reward in store for all who do and suffer here for His Name's sake. And in this connection consider the splendid example set us by our Lord. How nobly did He cast His bread upon the waters when He surrendered even life itself for our sakes, when He let loose that life of His, Bread of His sacred flesh, "Bread of the world in mercy broken," that He might find it again, when He saw of the travail of His soul and was satisfied. Nor was even *He* unmindful of the reward; for is it not written of Him—"Who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God"?

Then there is the great lesson of patience in working for Christ set before us in the text. It is after "many days" we are taught to expect results. "Be not weary in well-doing," says St. Paul, "for in due season ye shall reap if ye faint not." It is those "who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honour and immortality," that reap eternal life. "Ye have need of patience that after ye have done the will of God ye may receive the promise." We cannot always see at once the fruit of our labours we may never see it at all in this life. The first missionaries to Greenland died without hearing of a single convert to Christianity, but the next company of missionaries who went out reaped the fruit of *their* labours who had gone before.

There is a way in which we may cast our bread upon the waters that is not as much thought of or practised as it might be. "A word spoken in due season how good is it." We do not sufficiently realise the force of our words either for good or evil. We can never tell the effect of a word spoken for a brother's good—spoken humbly, cautiously, gently, it may be, almost reluctantly. We do not value enough the importance of our words, and how far-reaching they often are in their consequences. A word may either make or mar, save or ruin, be a savour of life unto life, or a savour of death unto death to, our brother man. A bad word, a word suggestive of sin, may be like a poisoned arrow spreading spiritual gangrene in the soul, while a good word, a word spoken in love and gentleness, may prove the turning-point in the history of an immortal spirit. So important are our words from this point of view, that our Lord says, "By thy words shalt thou be judged, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned." Cast but one good word upon the waters of life down which some fellow-voyager is travelling with you, and you know not when you may find it—hear of the happy result—it may be "after many days."

I know not where this proverb is better illustrated than in the education of the young. This is truly the casting of bread upon the waters, but the act is full of hope. What may we not expect from boys and girls brought up under good influences, instructed in the principles of the Christian religion, taught their duty towards God and their duty towards their neighbour from their earliest infancy? Now I plead with you to-day in the interests of the religious training of the young, for our Diocesan

Board of Religious Education, which has this great object in view—the organizing of religious knowledge in all the schools of this united and, in some respects, most important diocese in Ireland. It has been said, cultivate only the intellectual part of a man's nature, and the probability is you will turn out an educated devil; cultivate only his moral and spiritual nature, and you will have little better than a religious fool; but Cultivate body, soul, and spirit, and then you will have the perfect man. Now in all our National Schools the State looks after secular things; it sees that the secular knowledge imparted to the children attains to the required standard. The Church says it must not be behind hand in looking after the religious education of the children, and to see that this is done systematically and efficiently is the great purpose of the Diocesan Board of Religious Education. It has now been at work for many years. Religious instruction in our schools is organised on a system; it goes on wheels, it goes hand in hand with secular instruction, and you are requested to-day to supply it with some of the needful funds for carrying on its most important functions. You are asked to cast your bread upon the waters, and you may do it in the assurance that it will not be in vain. You will find it after many days, if not by yourselves by your children, who come after you. It will be found in those principles of quietness, loyalty and industry, which only flourish where a people are brought up to "love the brotherhood, fear God, and honour the King." An act of faith, an act of love, an act of obedience, an act of patient hope, to all this are you invited to-day.

THE Bishop of London reopened St. John's, Clerkenwell on Saturday last. The old church dates back to 1185, when it was the priory church of the Knights of St. John at Jerusalem. At the dissolution of monasteries the ancient order was dispersed, and the old priory church became the private residence of the Earl of Aylesbury. After this it was used as a school, but in 1732 Sir S. Michell partially rebuilt the place as a church, and transferred it to the commissioners under Queen Anne for the erection of churches in the metropolis,

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1890.

INTEMPERATE TEMPERANCE.

WE witnessed the gathering of the combined forces of Separatism and Pseudo-temperance for the great display in Hyde Park last Saturday. We were sorry that other engagements deprived us of the privilege of hearing the actual addresses, but we walked the length of the marshalled hosts on the Thames Embankment, and saw them march past with all their flags and banners. These banners were imposing in two senses of the last word. There was an enormous number of them, but the majority of them were very slenderly accompanied, and not a few of them had no followers at all. By far the largest part of the processionists came in vehicles, private carriages, waggonettes, vans. Of these there was an almost uninterrupted line from Northumberland Avenue to Blackfriars Bridge. Their occupants were male and female, especially the latter, and chiefly of the lower middle class. Most of them bore the cognizance of some Nonconformist organisation. There were a few banners of Liberal Radical societies, but these were very scantily attended. The Church of England element was, so far as we could discern, confined to one single waggonette, distinguished by a placard bearing the title of St. Mary's Church, Bryanston Square, holding between twelve and twenty persons, some of whom were clergymen.

There were a number of large vans full of little boys of the poorest classes, one of which was labelled "the Victims." A great deal of money must have been spent in hiring all these vehicles; and it is to be hoped that the little boys had a good meal before they were dismissed home. All this must cost money—where does it come from? The demonstrators were a very silent body, with no outward appearance of enthusiasm. The

busiest persons were Salvation Army girls on foot, who seemed to sell a great quantity of *War Cries.* Perhaps, if we had seen Cardinal Manning's contingent, which mustered elsewhere, in Westminster, we should have seen more fun.

The Home Rule element would have enlivened matters by a mixture of political enthusiasm, and an infusion of Irish gaiety. We only speak of what was to be seen on the Embankment. The feeling with which we came away was one of hearty thankfulness, that, with the one inconsiderable exception named, the Church of England had kept clear of the business. It was a got-up display, bought and paid for, with nothing spontaneous about it.

Not having been eye or ear witnesses of what took place in Hyde Park, we will only comment on the resolutions proposed, which are printed (we suppose officially) as follows :—

1. "That this meeting indignantly protests against the Government proposal to provide money from the public funds for the purchase of 'interests' in premises licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors, Parlimentary enactments and the highest legal decisions having uniformly limited the privilege conferred by a license to the yearly term for which it is granted. And the meeting reprobates the attempt made by Her Majesty's Ministers, unsanctioned by the electors and in defiance of public opinion, to create a vested interest in licenses involving hundreds of millions of money, and thus to endow a class already dangerously rich and powerful at the cost of untold poverty and wretchedness of great masses of our fellow-countrymen; and this meeting hereby adopts the following petition to Parliament, and requests the chairman to sign it on behalf of the meeting :—'To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of inhabitants of London, assembled at one of the meetings constituting the aggregate demonstration in Hyde Park, Saturday, June 7, 1890, showeth : That your petitioners view with intense disapprobation the Compensation Clauses of the Local Taxation Bill. Your petitioners, therefore, pray your Honourable House to exclude such clauses from the Bill, and to enact a measure by which the inhabitants of localities would be enabled, freely and directly, to veto the issue or re-issue of licenses within their respective districts. And your petitioners will ever pray.'" 2. "That this meeting strongly condemns the action of the Right Honourable Henry Matthews, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, in having instructed the Metropolitan Police authorities to prevent the various processions to this demonstration, traversing the ordinary thoroughfares of the Metropolis, thus attempting to obstruct a peaceable demonstration of public opinion, and causing needless irritation to great masses of law-abiding citizens."

We are sorry that any clergymen of the Church of England should have been found willing to move these resolutions, but still more glad that their number was so small. The resolutions are clap-trap, as Mr Gladstone well knew, when He dictated or inspired them; but some points in them involve an offence of a deeper dye. The movers of them knew perfectly well that "no vested interest would be created in licenses," and that no class would be "endowed" by Mr. Goschen's measure, and that no "attempt was being made by Her Majesty's Ministers" to do either of these things.

However, this great sham has been shammed, and ended; and it remains to be seen what effect it will have produced on Mr. Gladstone's political prospects, and what upon the Temperance Movement. Perhaps those among your readers, who have kept their zeal for temperance distinct from their political opinions, will be prepared to listen to a few words of truth and soberness.

The reason why temperance makes no progress is, to a very great extent, the faults of its advocates. Those faults are (as we noticed in a previous number) their exaggerations, extravagance, and frequent actual untruthfulness. These qualities were exemplified afresh in Hyde Park last Saturday. Their other faults are their preference for despotic measures, their advocacy of which not only fails to promote, but also actually hinders the free growth of conviction in favour of temperance; and their entire neglect of all considerations of justice in their treatment of the person whom they consider their enemy, the unfortunate publican. Now the publican has a right to justice, like other tradesmen, and, irrespective of all considerations of right, it is impossible to extirpate him. He satisfies a want, existing in large classes, not only of alcoholic liquors, but also of intercourse and society. If, by violent autocratic laws, he is suppressed in one form, he will reappear in another, and probably a worse. The efforts of temperance advocates should be directed not to his extirmination, but to his improvement—an effort which is by no means utopian.

Mr. Booth, in his work upon East-end labour bears witness, from personal knowledge, to the usefulness of public-houses, and to the improvement which is rapidly taking place in them. Means might be suggested by which this improvement could be made more rapid. The present improvement is mainly caused by the advance of civilisation amongst the lower and lower middle classes; and it is much more likely to increase, if the publicans are treated as human beings capable of better things, and not as mere vermin only fit to be exterminated. Let the temperance advocates acknowledge Boniface as a man and a brother, and try a little moral suasion on him to induce him to keep a decent house, which is by no means an impossible thing. Secondly, a much stricter discipline ought to be kept over existing public-houses; and, after a certain limited number of warnings, the licenses of offending houses should be forfeited inexorably and without compensation. The present licensing bodies are very lax in this respect, some from interested motives, many of their members being concerned directly or indirectly in the liquor trade, and others from mere unwillingness to give offence. Thirdly, all possible encouragement should be given to the possible rivals of the liquor dealers. It is quite practicable for enterprising persons to cut them out and supersede them. Consider the wonderful success of the aërated bread shops. If

establishments like those, supplied (as they are not) with arrangements for society and amusement, were worked by persons as skilful in attracting customers as publicans are, and kept open on Sundays and holidays, they would become a very formidable rival to public-houses; and the license tax, which might be increased indefinitely on the dealer in alcohol, would still further handicap him in the race against the seller of temperance beverages only.

It is by means like these that the evil of public-houses may be mitigated. And, to diminish their numbers, there are but two means—one, that which we have already mentioned, the final forfeiture of all offending houses; and the other, that which the Government have been proposing on a small and modest scale—the purchasing up of rights, whenever an opportunity offers, by a public body, constituted and supplied with funds for the purpose. We trust that the temperance advocates, and especially those clergymen, who permitted themselves to be made use of by the politicians, may repent of having sold their souls to Mr. Gladstone, and for the future eschew the political stump, and trust to moral persuasion, and temperate influence, rather than to legislative tyranny and mob despotism.

THE TIME OF JACOB'S TROUBLE.

An Inquiry into the Purport of Revelation xii.

By the Rev. RALPH W. HARDEN, B.A.

(*Continued from page* 274.)

Part II.

But this makes it necessary to define specifically what we mean by this *testimony of Jesus*. It is immaterial whether we call it the testimony about Jesus, or that of which He is the Author and Source. The latter indeed is the sense in which the genitive is most frequently employed by St. John in connection with this word *testimony*. For example: "the testimony of John" (Jno. i. 19), "the witness of men," "the witness of God" (1 Jno. v. 9), do not mean testimony about John, men, God, but the witness which these severally bear. (See also Jno. iii. 11, 32; v. 31; viii. 17; Rev. xi. 7). "The testimony of Jesus" accordingly is that of which Christ is the Author and Giver; that "sure word of prophecy" (2 Pet. i. 19) which at once proceeds from Him, and of all which He is at one and the same time the beginning and the end; that sacred Book whose inspired penmen, we are told, were "searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow them" (1 Pet. i. 11, R.V.)

And there are words in the Apocalypse itself which seem to me to establish this view. When St. John was about to worship the angel, the latter prevents him immediately: "See thou do it not: I am a fellow-servant with thee and with thy brethren that hold the testimony of Jesus" (Rev. xix. 10). Now this is a statement that would need explanation, for the Apostle as well as for ourselves. For if these "brethren" (to be identified with the *remnant* of xii. 17), had rejected Jesus while the Church was still on earth, how could they be supposed to have learned anything of Him, to have become possessed of His testimony, after that Church was received up to be with Jesus, and they left without a teacher? For while they are on earth in the midst of tribulation it is undoubtedly the Church which is beheld with Jesus, issuing from heaven, clothed "in fine linen bright and pure" (Rev. xix. 14). How therefore, we ask, have these faithful remaining ones become possessed of anything in connection with Jesus? The explanation is given by the angel: "For the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy"—rather the spirit of *the prophecy*, τῆς προφητείας—*i.e.*, "the testimony of Jesus," that of which He is the Author and the End alike, is "the spirit of the prophecy" of which the well-known prophecy—uttered by God "unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners" (Heb. i. 1)—is full, and with which it breathes.

Taken therefore in this sense, as the inspired volume of the Old Testament revelation (actually called "the testimony of the Lord," Ps. xix. 7) this *holding the testimony of Jesus* by the remnant of the Jews has a forcible significance in the Apocalypse that is utterly lost in the loose and inexact meaning of *bearing testimony* which is commonly assigned to it. It foretells for the Old Testament Oracles a prominence in the latter days heretofore unknown. In a special way it connects these Scriptures with Jesus of Nazareth, as the predicted Messiah of Israel, the Ruler of the Gentiles, the Sovereign Lord of the kingdoms of the world. And above all it distinguishes this ancient revelation as the object alike of the World's diabolic hatred and the Saints' indissoluble attachment amid the tremendous events at the close of this age's history. If the faithful few lose their lives in these approaching days of lawlessness, this is not predicted as on account of the holiness of their life or the fidelity of their service, though that would also be true. But they are declared to meet their death "on account of (διὰ) the word of God, and on account of (διὰ) the testimony which they hold" (Rev. vi. 9). The testimony itself, be it observed, and not the martyr's holding of it, being the first cause of their destruction. They are to be "beheaded for (διὰ) the testimony of Jesus, and for (διὰ) the word of God" (Rev. xx. 4). Or again, if the pæan of victory proclaims in heaven the glorious triumph of martyrs over Satan upon earth—"They overcame him because of (διὰ) the blood of the Lamb, and because of (διὰ) the word of their testimony," *i.e.*, the testimony which they loved and kept (Rev. xii. 11); this blood of the Lamb, and this word of the testimony it is which are set down as the efficient cause of victory, and not the sufferings of the saints themselves. It would be contrary to the whole spirit of the Gospel to place these on the same level with the blood of the Lamb. But this and the covenant of God, the word of the testimony, are the secret cause of the saints' victorious perseverance, that "they loved not their life even unto death."

From all this therefore I conclude that it is the Old Testament as the prophetic word of God which is to be the grand centre of the conflict in the last days—assailed by Satan, but cherished by the remnant of the Jewish nation as the last hope of refuge left to them

in the final struggle upon earth between the Evil and the Good.

And is it too much to say that even now the current of events is strongly setting in this direction? Thoughtful believers are beginning to realize that God's word, and most of all His prophetic word is losing its hold within the Church of Christ. Not that it is at all an object of less interest and discussion than of old, but that its position is ominously altered. What does the Bible say?—is not now the all-important question of the day. But rather, has the Bible any right to be heard at all? Is it more or better than the sacred books of other climes and peoples? Doubtless this is a quest that on occasion may be honestly engaged in, for the sake of the ignorant and them that are out of the way (Heb. v. 2). But if its echoes be all that is heard within the Church her members will soon begin to ask in doubt, Has she too become ignorant and wandering? Has the clamour of the adversary at last succeeded in deafening her own ear to the voice of God. Only too true are the thoughtful words of the editor of *Present Day Tracts*:—

"It is not altogether satisfactory that at this time of day so many of the best and finest minds in the Church of Christ are engaged in the defence of the truth against the assaults of unbelief, instead of being given to its proclamation and exposition . . . . . It will be a very hopeful sign when the need and the demand for apologetic work become less and less, and the need and the demand for positive and constructive work become more and more, because men, conscious of a darkness which no mere advance of knowledge can ever dissipate, and of needs which no human or earthly resources can ever supply, are disposed to learn of Him who is 'the Light of the world,' and are hungering for 'the Bread of Life.'" *

Whether we regard the pulpit, whence the flock of Christ should be tended in the pastures of the word, or watch those multifarious movements which it is fondly hoped will extend the bounds or foster the growth of the Church, we miss from them all, with sorrowful surprise, the element of the word itself, the living and quickening voice of God. Do we open a volume of sermons to satisfy the desire of our souls, the one longing of our hearts, what is it that God really says to us in this or that text to which we have turned? For all the pages of homily presented to us, how little nearer are we brought to the knowledge of the force or meaning of the Divine utterance? The text has stood the preacher in good stead as a motto for the speculations of man. But it was not deemed worth the labour of discovery what it is that God Himself intended us to understand by it.

And how fares the Bible in all the modern machinery of Congresses and Conventions, of Church and Salvation Armies, by which it is sought to revive and energize the drooping Churches? Alas! in all alike the more closely we inspect the more reason to fear that "the sword of the Spirit" is not recognized as it ought to be, as "God's power unto salvation" (Rom. i. 16). Must we not fear that the tale of man's experience or the conflict of human opinions in all too often drown the accents of the word of God?

And if this be true of Bible doctrines in general, much more is it true of the Bible prophecy. The essential idea of the Prophet has come to be ignored by the wise and learned of the Church, who represent him only as the preacher to instruct his age, and not as the ambassador to deliver to it the words which he has received directly and supernaturally from God Himself. For, in translating the present into the past, as the fashion now is, these teachers forget that the Prophet of the old time enjoyed an audience of God vouchsafed to no preacher of the Cross since the days of the Apostles. It matters not how or in what way God communicated to them His will, whether "by means of visions and dreams, sometimes mouth to mouth (comp. Num. xii. 6 ff.), sometimes immediately, sometimes by the intervention of an angel, sometimes under the veil of symbols and types, sometimes without these." * However it was matters not: enough for us to know that God hath "of old time spoken unto the fathers in the Prophets" (Heb. i. 1). "In (ἐν) the Prophets"—"which implies that God, in revealing Himself to the fathers by the Prophets, was present in the latter, was indwelling with them, in such wise that the Prophets were only the outward organs of speech for the God who spoke in them. Comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Matt. x. 20." *

But now, all this is overlooked. The Prophet, we are now taught, is simply the man of his age; of surpassing genius or commanding intellect; a sagacious counsellor, a daring leader, a cultured orator; a poet whose imagination never fails him. But of his *divine* commission we hear nothing. The glorious Vision, to which he is summoned that he may receive his message, is only a reflex of "that grandeur of imagination, which is the distinctive mark of his genius." * And the "call" itself may mean nothing more than "an inward prompting, the guidance of which he could not resist" †—much the same, we may suppose, as moves the devout missionary of our own day to go forth obediently to bear the Gospel to the dark places of the earth.

With such mundane ideas of the Prophet and his "call," it is no wonder if the Prophet's testimony appear only as a contemporary history, to be symbolically accommodated to the varying needs of the world's future as the fanciful ingenuity of the scholar may think proper to interpret it.

We watch with delight the pen of a master who has faithfully traced out the mind of Jehovah revealing itself concerning the *remnant*. "Isaiah's most characteristic doctrine is the idea of a judgment imminent upon the nation, accompanied by the preservation of a faithful remnant, for whom a new and blissful era will then immediately begin. This doctrine is first adumbrated at the time of Isaiah's call (vi. 13): it is soon afterwards embodied by him in the name of his son, 'Shear-jashub,' *i.e.*, *A remnant shall return* (viz., to God): it appears subsequently under many different figures and in different contexts, and holds its place in his last recorded utterance (B.C. 701), chap. xxxvii. 31 ff. The significance of this doctrine to Isaiah has been indicated before (p. 21 ff.). The chosen nation is imperishable; but Divine justice requires that its unworthy members should be swept away: the rest, purged and renovated, will then form the foundation of a new community, exhibiting the *ideal* character of the people (Exod. xix. 6, 'an *holy* nation')." ‡

In all this (if we except this last word "ideal") there seems sure footing for faith. The expositor is

* Present Day Tracts, No. 53, pp. 47, 48.

* Lünemann, "Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Hebrews." On chap. i. 1.

† Canon S. R. Driver: "Isaiah; His Life and Times," page 16.

‡ *Ibid.* Page 110.

dealing with the word of God; and in all the announcement there is nothing that is not easy and intelligible. True, the fulfilment has yet to come. But that creates no difficulty seeing the word is not that of the man, Isaiah, but of Him who *in Isaiah** declares "the end from the beginning, and from ancient times things that are not yet done" (Isa. xlvi. 10). Besides, we have an earnest already that Israel's Jehovah is not unmindful of His promise. There is the land which He has jealously guarded till now. And there is the people, after eighteen centuries of expatriation, kept through every vicissitude and in these later years increased and prospered beyond all human calculation. And there is moreover another utterance of the same Voice, only breathed through another instrument: "The vision is yet for an appointed time, and it hasteth toward the end, and shall not lie: though it tarry wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not delay" (Hab. ii. 3, R.V.). And so we wait and stay ourselves upon our God.

But our repose is rudely shocked when our expositor proceeds to improve the word of Jehovah, deeming it only a description which "Isaiah pictures to himself." † We are told: "Isaiah's visions must not be read literally. In their literal sense, they never were realised; and, we may safely add, they never can be realised in the future. The circumstances under which their realisation was possible, have long since passed away; the basin of the Mediterranean Sea is no longer the chief centre of the world's civilization and industry; there are no Philistines or Ammonites (xi. 14), to own the suzerainty of restored Israel; there is no sanctuary on Zion (Jno. iv. 21) privileged to witness the adoration of the converted Ethiopians (chap. xviii. 7). Isaiah's genius enabled him to clothe his ideas in noble imagery; and a gallery of gorgeous pictures, the delight and wonder of the ages, but significant often *symbolically*, rather than literally, is his legacy to humanity." ‡

If prophecy be only the creation of the Prophet's genius, the gorgeous painting of his own imagination, talk of the impossibility of fulfilment may be excusable. But for those who hold that "No prophecy ever came by the will of man: but man spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. i. 21), it is as dogmatic as it is puerile to affirm of any word of God, This is not, and therefore it will not be: this will not not be, and therefore it is impossible. That which appeared not only possible but probable to a George Eliot §—of the world worldly—may well be accepted by the believer as certain, upon the utterance of the Prophet which is the Voice of God.

If then the set of current of popular opinion in Christendom points to the word of prophecy as Satan's chief object of assault until the remnant of the seed of the woman are become its last and most resolute defenders, it is not difficult to account for his hatred on the one side, and their unflinching fidelity on the other. In this *testimony* remember, repose those sacred covenants which entail the Land upon Israel as his everlasting possession, and as a consequence of this, the final overthrow of Satan's usurped sovereignty over the earth.

"I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God" (Gen. xvii. 8). Such are the concise but unmistakeable terms of the unchangeable covenant made with Abraham by the God that cannot lie and will not repent. Four hundred years later the same God reveals to His servant Moses the future transgression and consequent suffering of the lately emancipated Hebrews. But He is careful at the same time to point out the inviolability of the original promise. When the land shall have enjoyed her Sabbaths, and the people shall have accepted the punishment of their iniquity, "then," Jehovah declares, "will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land" (Levit. xxvi. 42). Four hundred years more roll on, and the Royal Psalmist, the man after God's own heart, awakens his people to the recollection of their covenant-keeping God, and the promise which He had established to them. "He hath remembered His covenant for ever, the word which He commanded to a thousand generations; which covenant He made with Abraham, and His oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance" (Ps. cv. 8-11). Once more; another four hundred years is past. The nation has filled up the cup of its transgression, and the predicted judgments are at hand. But even here "the scattering" must not take place, until the very Voice of God reminds them that "the gathering" shall as surely be fulfilled. "I will gather them out of all countries whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, and I will plant them in this land assuredly with my whole heart and with my whole soul" (Jer. xxxii. 37, 41). And this, we must remember, is a pledge that still awaits its redemption. The scattered has not yet been gathered. The land still knows not its own people. Nor is it one kingdom only of the divided nation which shall enjoy possession; but Israel as well as Judah, both together under the one King David, must reap the fulfilment of the everlasting promise, "I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever" (Ezek. xxxvii. 22, 25).*

In the face of a covenant thus solemnly and repeatedly assured, of a people literally scattered, as the word foretold, of a country defined beyond the possibility of mistake; in the face too of the same people preserved as by a miracle to the present hour, without a home, solitary among the nations, yet still expectant of their land and of their restoration—how can believers in the Bible pervert or spirit away its words! If they point the sceptic to a literal Israel scattered in the past, how can they excuse their own unbelief in the re-gathering of the same people, only

* Professor Delitzsch maintains what Canon Driver denies—the certainty of Isaiah's authorship of chaps. xl—lxvi. "Comm. on Isaiah," vol. ii., page 132.

† Canon Driver, "Isaiah," page 22. ‡ Ib., page 111.

§ See Daniel Deronda, page 27 "Note."

* The reader should consult Dr. Keith's "Land of Israel," chap. i. "The perpetuity of the Covenant concerning the Land."

because the hour of fulfilment is not yet come? If I am to surrender the certainty of the Bible's plain, intelligible language for the vague and ever-shifting spiritualizings which are said to interpret it, I know not what other realities of the historic faith I may next be driven to explain away. If the Zion to which the Redeemer shall come (Isa. lix. 20; Rom. xi. 26), is the company of believers and not the city where that Redeemer Himself taught and bled and died, how may I be assured that the Coming of this Blessed One is not itself likewise but the fairy dawn of some higher life, some more cultured existence, anything that the preacher of the day may be pleased to prophecy, rather than that which I look and long for—"This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven" (Acts i. 11).

No. If the Redeemer is to return at all, the same language which bids me believe it compels my faith to expect Him then as "The Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David" (Rev. v. 5), the Child of her who is the mother also of the remnant "which have the testimony of Jesus." If I am to believe that this earth shall again behold His reviving presence, the one warrant for my faith is that same word which also fixes His returning feet upon the sacred slopes of Olivet (Zech. xiv. 4), from whence they were uplifted all but two thousand years ago. If I have any ground to hope that ever peace shall visit and abide upon this troubled globe, that righteousness shall calm the angry passions of the men who dwell upon it, that sorrow and sighing shall ever flee away, I must lose it all and lose it for ever if I let go the one prophetic fact on which this glorious hope is founded: "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i. 32, 33).

But this is the very object of the Adversary. He would have believers abandon the title-deeds of Israel's possession that then they might forfeit their own inheritance afterwards. Who knows so well as he that "the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord" (Acts iii. 19) are inseparably bound up with Israel's repentance and forgiveness? And therefore "the testimony of Jesus" must be destroyed; the covenants of promise are there. It must be torn from the hands of its possessors. And when the world shall have surrendered—as surrender it will—the word of prophecy first, the Gospel of salvation after, then comes the "time of Jacob's trouble," when the bulk of the nation shall forget its God and "forsake the holy covenant" (Dan. xi. 30)—all, save the remnant of the seed of the woman, which "have the testimony of Jesus."

The seed of her "whose Child was caught up unto God and unto His throne!" His brethren therefore, His mother's children. And therefore when "the Child caught up unto God" returns from God "in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him" (Matt. xxv. 31), the relationship is neither forgotten nor disowned. "My brethren" are the silent ones who stand around that throne of glory in presence of both "sheep and goats." "An hungred, thirsty, strangers, naked, sick, in prison." Descriptive words! How vividly they picture the recent conflict of the sorrow-stricken, while they "held the testimony of Jesus!" How touchingly they disclose the unutterable love of Israel's Shepherd and great Elder Brother—the Angel-Jehovah which redeemeth him from every evil! (Gen. xlviii. 16).

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—In the current number of the PULPIT, Mr. Henslow says: 1. "No Evolutionist ever supposed that man's genealogy had anything whatever to do with baboons, or apes of any kind."

Darwin (an Evolutionist presumably!) on the contrary, says: "Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears. . . . This creature . . . would have classed among the *Quadrumana*."

"QUADRUMANA.—The sixteenth order of Mammals is that of *Quadrumana*, comprising the apes, monkeys, baboons," etc. (Nicholson's "Manual of Zoology," sixth edition, page 771).

2. Henslow also says that Mr. Evans falls back "upon the old, old statement that hybrids are barren." I fall back on this "old, old statement," because it is such "a true, true statement," and Nature's own commentary (more to the point than some commentaries) on the opening page of Scripture. That very eminent scientific writer, M. de Quatrefages, says: "I here make the statement as an established fact, on the authority even of Darwin, that all *known* facts attest the *perfect fertility* of mongrels. . . . Crosses between *species*, or *hybrids*, will exhibit facts of an entirely contrary nature."

3. Mr. Henslow further remarks: "If plants cannot vary 'indefinitely,' will Mr. Evans undertake to 'define' the limits of their variation? No, sir, I will not undertake to do this until the Evolutionists supply us with a satisfactory definition of the sense in which they use the word *species*. To again quote M. de Quatrefages: "Darwin had formed no clear conception of the sense which he attributed to the word *species*. I have been unable to find in any of his works a single precise statement on this point. The accusation is more severe from being brought with justice against an author who claims to have discovered the *origin of species*."

4. Mr. Henslow objects to a "quotation from Shakspeare that has done duty before." I fear that he must expect a troublous existence, for Shakespeare is the mouthpiece of the common sense and experience of mankind, and his pithy observations are now familiar in our mouths as household words. This time, however, I will try Wordsworth, and ask him how Evolutionists can account for the appearance of "the lovely apparition" the poet describes:

> A spirit, yet a woman, too!
> * * * *
> A countenance in which did meet
> Sweet records, promises as sweet;
> A creature, not too bright nor good
> For human nature's daily food,
> For transient sorrows, simple wiles,
> Praise, blame, love, kisses, tears, and smiles.
> * * * *
> A Being, breathing thoughtful breath,
> A traveller betwixt life and death;
> The reason firm, the temperate will,
> Endurance, foresight, strength, and skill;
> A perfect woman, nobly planned
> To warn, to comfort, and command,
> And yet a spirit still, and bright
> With something of an angel light."

Is all this, too, the result of evolution, of progress

through countless ages from "a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits"? Why should Darwin have the privilege of talking rubbish without rebuke? One wonders whether his rugged features relaxed into a smile as he penned this precious nonsense.

5. If Mr. Henslow is satisfied with the result of his somewhat Machiavellian sentence—which, as he has now confessed, and will forgive—that his first letter was written, not to convince, but "to draw out Mr. Evans to reply," I have no great reason to complain. I did reply, and certain it is that Mr. Henslow has made no perceptible impression on any single one of the positions established in my letter.

H. HEBER EVANS.

June 9, 1890.

SIR,—It would require a volume fully to expose all the fallacy in Mr. Heber Evans's letter on Evolution in THE PULPIT of 31st May. I will, however, notice a few points.

He writes:—"Mr. Henslow says that Sir Charles Lyell, a leader in geology, carefully investigated the theory, and then accepted it. *Yes, but only after the greatest doubt and hesitation.* Who can say that he would not by this time have gone back to his original opinion?" The words which I have italicised appear to show that in the writer's judgment an opinion is worth the less, and is the more likely to be abandoned if it is formed with great care and in opposition to previous prejudice.

He appears throughout to think that one clever man's opinion is as good as another's. Thus, he quotes the opinions of Carlyle, Lord Hatherley, and Mr. Thring, who had no special knowledge of the laws of organic life, against such specialists in the sciences of life as Darwin and Huxley. Would he admit that a man of mere general ability is as good an authority on an astronomical question as a great mathematician? Or, to come nearer to his own subject, that a mere popular preacher is as good an authority on Scriptural interpretation as a great historical and linguistic scholar?

I would value Sir John Herschell's opinion, if I had it, on any subject whatever, from Biblical interpretation to bi-metallism, and here is what he wrote to Sir Charles Lyell in 1836, before the word Evolution had come into use, and before Darwin's name was known:—

"I cannot but think it an inadequate conception of the Creator to assume it as granted that His combinations are exhausted upon any one of the theatres of their former exercise; though in this, as in all His other works, we are led by all analogy to suppose that He operates through a series of intermediate causes, and that, in consequence, the origination of fresh species, could it ever come under our cognizance, would be found to be a natural as distinguished from a miraculous process, although we perceive no indications of any process actually in progress which is likely to issue in such a result."—From the appendix to "Babbage's Ninth Bridgewater Treatise," p. 203.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, June 3rd, 1890.

Mr. Heber Evans thinks the position of specialists should be that of witnesses, not judges. Darwin and Huxley are to be the witnesses, Carlyle, Lord Hatherley, and Mr. Thring the judges, representing between them literary force, legal acuteness, and knowledge of human nature. Would these powers enable men to weigh scientific evidence, or even to see its relevancy?

JUDGE WARREN'S PAMPHLET.

SIR,—Will you allow me a few words in reply to my courteous critic, "B."?

He accuses me of bad grammar; but what he quotes was a misprint, owing to my bad writing. What I said was that the Privy Council ruled that "under the misnomer of regeneration, conversion may take place before, in, or after baptism." The printer gave, "made the misnomer," instead of "under the misnomer," which, of course, made nonsense of the sentence.

2. "B." denies that the Privy Council so ruled as to regeneration, under the name of conversion. I maintain that it was on *this* ground that the Privy Council decided that Dr. Gorham's doctrine was not contrary to the Prayer-Book. If it was not on this ground, I ask on what ground was it?

3. I may have been wrong in naming Secker, as one who spoke of conversion under the name of regeneration. If I was wrong I am glad for his memory sake. But that it was the fashion, for an age or so, to divide one's hearers into regenerate and *un*-regenerate, meaning converted and *un*-converted, no one can deny. It was on this ground that the Privy Council refused to unchurch Dr. Gorham on account of his falling into this common, yet most gross, misuse of terms.

4. "B." challenges my saying that the Church allows no other sense as to the grace of baptism but the one I stand up for. I still maintain the same. The Church asserts of every infant, and of every fit adult, that it is regenerated in baptism. If assertion to God and man is to go for nothing, what remains? But, what is this regeneration? Not conversion, *pace* the Privy Council. It is impossible with infants. With fit adults, it is past. The Judge says that regeneration is "the death unto sin" of the Catechism. So say I. But what does the Judge mean by this, "Death unto sin," etc. Not conversion! What then can he mean? There is no meaning possible but mine. "A death unto sin," etc., means that, by Christ's death, sins condemning power over the baptised is dead. "A new birth unto righteousness," etc., means that, in baptism, we are endued with grace to lead a life of righteousness.

5. "B." asks "what authority has your reviewer to say that the Church allows this and does not allow that"? I answer, she has decided in her services, Articles, Catechisms, etc., what she allows and what she disallows. "B." goes on, "the Church allows, and must allow, because it is in this free country, subject to the State, and the State's tribunals, a very great diversity on all points of doctrine." "*All* points of doctrine," is very comprehensive language. Of course the State, as France did, may decree that there is no God; and may rule that those denying a God may legally hold office in the Church. But that does not change the fact that the Church has ruled so-and-so.

6. As "B." denies again that I understand the difference between us and Rome as to the effect of baptism, I will tell him that our notion is, not that there is any magical effect in the water itself, as poured on a dead or insensible person, but that the grace of God uses the water, with prayer, as "a means

whereby we receive the grace, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

REVIEWER OF THE JUDGES' PAMPHLET.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—Pray allow me a few words in reply to Mr. E. Lawrence. May not "false gods" mean evil spirits? Thus Jehovah is said in the Psalms to be "above all Gods."

Mr. E. Lawrence acknowledges that "our Lord had a thorough spiritual understanding of the Scripture." Very well. But this is contrary to the other theory, that He was in ignorance so long as He lived.

No one doubts that our Lord taught in parables. But then it was plain *when* he spoke in parables, and *when* of historic facts, or of events as if they were real.

If I have spoken disrespectfully of "Presbyter," or others, St. Paul did the same of St. Peter. All I meant was that their teaching makes our Lord's authority as an expositor of the Old Testament, a mere nothing. If one is to go to the wall, is it to be our Lord or "Presbyter"? I ask Mr. E. Lawrence that. If we may set aside our Lord's teaching in the New Testament, this, I think, makes nothing of the inspiration of the Gospels, contrary to our 6th Article.

Mr. E. Lawrence asks, how I know that our Lord referred to Jonah as a real historic person? I reply that He makes His resurrection only a similar fact. If one was a fable, why not the other also? If I say, I shall die, as surely as Cinderella's coach faded away, what can any one think but that one is as imaginary as the other? I can see no difference between fables, parables, myths, and apologues. If I speak with irreverence of new theories, that does not involve irreverence for God and His word.

If Mr. Faithful's accusation of "self-conceit" is meant for me, I pass it over. "Unwarrantable," he says, "is more easily measured." Be it so! I am quite ready to be measured.

C. C., V.-G.

THE prelections of the candidates for the Divinity Professorship at Cambridge, were delivered last week; they aroused a good deal of interest, though the attendance was somewhat meagre. There was a mistaken impression abroad that only members of the Senate might attend, and that the general public would be refused admittance. Mr. Wood made a very great impression by his discourse on the Soul and the Body, and Mr. Watson's argument on the date of Genesis aroused much interest in an audience that had already listened to two prelections in the same day. The appointment of Dr. Swete will, however, be hailed with hearty satisfaction; he is widely known as a scholar, and the lectures which he gave when he was tutor of Caius are still remembered as models in their kind. His long experience both as a pastor and a teacher marks him out as a man who will be a very real acquisition, and add greatly to the strength of the Divinity Professoriate. The mode of election by a body which contains few if any members who are specially interested in theology, has been much criticised; but it has at all events yielded an admirable result.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Acheson, Rev. Johnston Hamilton, M.A., Honorary Canon in Chester Cathedral.
Anderson, Rev. David, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Twickenham; Chaplain to the Bishop of Marlborough.
Askew, Rev. R., Rector of Winterborne Zelston, Blandford.
Aslachsen, Rev. C. W., Curate of All Saints', Scarborough.
Bell, Rev. John William Bussey, M.A., Vicar of Pyrton, Oxon.
Browne, Rev. R. C. L., M.A., Vicar of North Curry, Somerset; Rector of Hever, Kent.
Bush, Rev. Henry Biddulph, B.A., Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Cardew, Rev. William Berry, M.A., Public Preacher in the Diocese of Southwell.
Coleman, Rev. William, Rector of Smeeton, Westerby, Leicestershire.
Cundey, Rev. J. Worsley, M.A., Vicar of Emmanuel, Bolton; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Davenport, Rev. George Horatio, M.A., Vicar of Mansel Lacy, Hereford.
Douglas, Rev. R., M.A., Chaplain of All Saints', Rouen.
Draper, Rev. William Henry, M.A., Rector of Middleton Stoney, Oxon; Surrogate for the Diocese.
Greenall, Rev. Thomas Wright, M.A., Vicar of Bishampton, Worcestershire.
Greenwood, Rev. Robert, Curate-in-Charge of St. Paul's, Westleigh, Manchester.
Hall, Rev. E. G., M.A., Vicar of St. Anne's, Wandsworth.
Hancock, Rev. Bernard W., Curate of St. Mary-le-Wigford, Lincoln; Vicar of Nettleham, Lincolnshire.
Hancox, Rev. Joseph, Vicar of Great Finborough, Stowmarket.
Joynes, Rev. Richard, B.D., Honorary Canon of St. Alban's Cathedral; Public Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Lamb, Rev. Henry William, M.A., Vicar of Marston-on-Dove, Derbyshire.
Leach, Rev. Edmund Foxcroft, B.A., Rector of St. John's, Manchester.
Mais, Rev. John Brodie Stuart, L.Th., Rector of Tansley, Derbyshire.
Meara, Rev. H. G. J., M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Maidenhead.
Newman, Rev. Ernest F., M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
Orlebar, Rev. Jeffrey Edward, M.A., Senior Curate of Upper St. Leonard's; Organising Secretary for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in the Southern Province.
Sawyer, Rev. William George, M.A., Rector of Taplow, Bucks.
Sill, Rev. Ernest R., Curate of St. Gabriel's, Hulme; Chaplain to her Majesty's Forces at Aldershot.
Thomas, Rev. Henry, Vicar of Penydarren; Perpetual Curate of Ystrad Mynach.
Vandeleur, Rev. Gerald Ormsby, M.A., Rector of Ravenstowe, Derbyshire.
Villiers, Rev. H. Montague, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Wilton-place; Chaplain to the Bishop of Marlborough.
Warren, Rev. Charles, M.A., Vicar of Nettleham; Rector of Grayingham, Lincolnshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Atkinson, Rev. Matthew, at 7, Boulevard, Weston-super-Mare, on the 3rd inst., aged 66 years.
Boyer, Rev. John Plummer, at Brantham Rectory, on the 4th inst., aged 33 years.
Hall, Rev. Charles Ranken, M.A., at Weston-super-Mare, lately Rector of Shirenewton, Chepstow, on the 5th inst., aged 78 years.
Harland, Rev. Edward, Vicar of Colwich, and Prebendary of Lichfield, at Bishton Hall, on the 8th inst., in his 81st year.
Horley, Rev. Edward, Rector of Sefton, at Edgerton Lodge, Leamington Spa, on the 7th inst., aged 66 years.
Pinder, Rev. James Gould, M.A., Chaplain to H.M. Forces, second son of the late Rev. H. S. Pinder, at Portobello Barracks, Dublin, on the 31st ult., aged 33 years.
Philpot, Rev. Henry, late Rector of St. Peter's, Abaco, and St. Stephen's, Bimini, Bahamas, at 9, East-cliff, Dover, on the 4th inst.
Rynd, Henry Nassau, twenty-three years Vicar of Shinfield, Reading, at Shinfield Vicarage, on the 4th inst., aged 69 years.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE VICTORY OF FAITH.

By Rev. Canon LIDDON, D.D.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, On Sunday Afternoon, April 13th, 1890.

"This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."—1 John v. 4.

AT Easter-time ideas of triumph are in the air. The victory of our Lord over death gives the keynote, and many other victories of a less splendid character group themselves round this central triumph. Some of them preceded it, as notably the deliverance of Israel from the Egyptian bondage. "Sing ye to the Lord," sang Miriam, "for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He cast into the sea." Some of them followed it, as when the Apostles, hitherto so lacking in clear conviction and in settled resolution, found themselves at Pentecost endued with power from on high, and took the first steps in their mighty task—the conversion of all nations to the faith of Christ. And thus it is in keeping with the suggestions of the season that the appointed Epistle to-day brings before us a particular victory, which it is most important that every Christian should in some way or other, at some time or other, or most probably again and again, win—namely, victory over the world. "This," exclaims St. John, "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." There is one particular reason for winning this victory which will have weight with all of us who have been baptized into the Church of Christ. We, at any rate, my baptized brethren—we have promised to win it. Before we were baptized we engaged, through those who represented us at the font, to renounce the world no less than the flesh and the devil; and this renunciation must surely have meant a moral victory—"Dost thou," said the minister to each of those who represented us at the font—"Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" And the answer was, "I renounce them all." Clearly it was a very serious engagement, made as a condition of our being baptized into Christ, and we are, therefore, concerned to ask what it is that we have thus undertaken to renounce and conquer—in other words, what exactly we mean by "the world." And here, first of all, it is obvious that, both in the Bible and in our common language, the word "world" is used in more senses than one. It is used sometimes of the universe or planet on which we live. Thus the Psalmist speaks of God existing everlastingly "or ever the earth and the world were made," and of God's having made the round world so fast that it cannot be moved. And Jeremiah says that God "established the world by His wisdom." And St. Paul preaches to the Athenians of God that "made the world and all things therein." And St. John says, in a hyperbolical way, that if all our Lord's acts were to be fully recorded he supposes that "even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." And St. Peter, speaking of the Flood, says that the world that then was, "being overflowed with water, perished." Thus the world of nature in which God has placed us as our home during this stage of existence is clearly not an object of renunciation or conquest. It has no moral colouring attached to it. Its main service to us, after affording a resting place and satisfying our wants, is to disclose, when we carefully examine it, something of the nature and attributes of the great and wonderful Being who made it. And, again, "the world is used in Holy Scripture of the aggregate, or at any rate of a large number, of human beings, viewed simply as human beings, and without any sort of reflection on their moral condition or on their bent of character. In this sense we are told that "a decree went out from Cæsar Augustus that all the world"—that is, all the inhabitants of the Roman Empire—"should be taxed." And the Apostles are described by the Jews at Thessalonica as men "who have turned the world upside down." And, in a more restricted sense, the Pharisees observed, after the raising of Lazarus, "that the world"—meaning thereby the population of Jerusalem and of the immediate neighbourhood—"had gone after Jesus Christ"; while in a much wider sense than that even of the Roman Empire, God is said to have so loved the world—meaning the whole family of man—as to have given "His only begotten Son" for it. And in this sense we sometimes speak quite rightly of "the judgment of the world"—meaning that of all men, or of the wisest of men—as having about it a security and a weight which cannot be ignored. And clearly this is not the world which is conquered or renounced by a good Christian. He is, on the contrary, under special obligations to do what he can to serve his fellow-men, by promoting their temporal and eternal interests. There is, however, a third use of the word in Scripture, which is more common than either of the preceding ones, and which is especially observable in the writings of St. John. In this sense the world means human life, and the temper, the views, the conduct which mark it as far as it is estranged from God. And thus our Lord says to his followers,

"If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you"; and to the Jews, "The world cannot hate you, but Me it hateth." And again, to His disciples, "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own, but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." In this sense, He promises the Spirit of Truth—"Whom the world cannot receive because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him." In this sense, He says, "My peace I give unto you," and predicts, "Ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice," and declares to the Father, "I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be Thine," and bids His disciples, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." And St. John's First Epistle, which reproduces in another form that element of our Lord's teaching which the writer was especially careful to report in his Gospel, is full of warnings and instructions respecting the world in the sense of human life alienated from God. "The world," he writes, "knoweth us not because it knew Him not." The false teachers of His day, he says, "are of the world," therefore speak they of the world. "Love not the world," he exclaims, "neither the things that are in the world, for if any man love the world the love of the Father is not in him," and "The world passeth away and the lust thereof." And so in the text, "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Nor is this way of employing the word "world" by any means confined to the writings of St. John. St. Paul writes to the Galatians "of this present evil world"; to the Corinthians of "the God of this world who hath blinded the minds of them that believe not"; to the Ephesians "of the rulers of the darkness of this world"; to the Romans a warning about being "conformed to this world"; to Timothy about Demas, who had forsaken him, "having loved this present world"; and St. Peter speaks bluntly of "the corruption that is in the world through lust," and of Christians as having escaped the pollutions of this world. And St. James says that a man's keeping himself unspotted from the world is a note of true religion, and he writes of a "friendship with the world" which means enmity with God.

Now, from these passages we gather that the world, in the sense thus condemned by Holy Scripture, is marked by two distinguishing characteristics. In the first place, it is the temper of mind which exaggerates the claims of the present and of the visible, and which, to say the least, throws into the background the claims of the future and the unseen. It makes the most of the seen; it plays off the seen against the unseen. "What we see," it whispers to us—"What we see is here; it is within our grasp. The unseen is distant; it is a matter of speculation." And as God is out of sight, the world keeps Him, so far as it can, out of mind, too, if only by its importunate insistence upon the claims of what we see; and as the future is no less out of sight than God, the world keeps it, too, out of mind by reiterating the praise of what is present. By the future, I mean, of course, that more remote and solemn future that follows death—the nearer future undoubtedly the world will do its best to command and make the most of. And, secondly, the temper of the world means the appropriation—or, rather, the monopoly—of desire by present and visible objects. Whether it be the higher or lower forms of desire, the world temper provides for each its special satisfaction, and encourages it to look for that satisfaction as the supreme good. Sometimes the satisfaction is addressed to ambition, sometimes to the passion for amusement, sometimes to the promptings of curiosity, sometimes to personal vanity, sometimes to mere acquisitiveness, sometimes to the sensual instincts; but in all these cases it has the result that, by providing a false object for desire, it shuts out the true object—namely, God. Desire, as you know, my brethren, was meant to keep the human soul just as the law of attraction keeps the planets, moving regularly round its true centre, God. And when some other object comes near enough to drag a soul from this which is its true moral orbit, the result is moral ruin. As St. John says, "All that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father"—that is its condemnation—"but is of the world." And here, perhaps, somebody is saying to himself, "Well, what is the harm if the world does influence us as you tell us? Why should we not be preoccupied with that which we see? Why should we not gratify our desires with the created objects that do gratify them, and while we may?" My brethren, this would be very sensible if we could be sure, only sure, that man's existence ended at death. The real point is this: What sort of a being is man? Is he only an animal, whose spiritual nature is an illusive and phosphorescent accompaniment of his bodily functions, or is he an immortal spirit, associated with a bodily frame, on the existence of which his real and deepest life is in no degree dependent? If the former, then the language which we read in the New Testament about the world is irrational fanaticism; but if the latter, the language is but a common sense item of our human existence. If man lives after death, lives for an eternity to which this life is no more than a petty antechamber, if man is made for God, can be satisfied lastingly only in God, and will find in God a happiness which transcends all speech, all thought, then surely any powerful influence which distracts man's eye from the true aim of his being, any series of object which take possession of that little stock of desire that is meant for the Eternal, does man himself a most serious injury; and this alienation of

man from God is exactly what the world in all generations brings about, and this is the reason the Gospel speaks of it with such uniform severity. We shall see this more clearly if we briefly trace, from our Lord's time downwards, the successive phases which the world—that is, human nature estranged from God—presents in its opposition to true religion, and observe how faith has overcome it. What, then, was the world of which our Lord Himself spoke as of something separate from and hostile to Himself and His disciples? Undoubtedly that world, practically speaking, was made up of the great majority of Jewish people—the zealous Pharisees, the cultivated, cool-headed, sceptical Sadducees, the intriguing and merely political Herodians, the priests of the higher and lower grades, the Scribes, the whole body of the officials attached to the Temple; and it included, too, that world of the local Roman Government, with the Procurator, Pontius Pilate, at the head, and the officers at the depôt at Cæsarea, and the great body of the civil and military officials. Of that world the great majority were Jews. They were attached, no doubt, to their ancestral religion, and that religion had come from God. But they had so lost sight of its true teaching and providential purpose that the things that should have been a help to them were unto them an occasion of falling. Its observances, instead of leading them to God, kept them at a distance from Him; its promises of a Messiah only opened up to them a very vulgar form of political vanity, instead of opening up to their souls a bright spiritual future. No doubt there were many souls in that world not of it, and not far from the kingdom of heaven—Pagan centurions, as we know, who were capable of greater faith than any that was found in Israel; doctors of the law, like Gamaliel and Nicodemus; a Joseph of Arimathea, a Simon of Cyrene; but, as a whole, it was the world which hated the disciples, it was the world which hated Christ before it hated the disciples, it was the world which, when the time came, showed its blind enmity to truth as our Lord said it would show it. Whatever else it had, it had not that true wisdom which sees the worthlessness of all that does not lead to God, that wisdom which none of the princes of the world knew, "for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory," and, accordingly, when it seemed to have crushed Him He had already vanquished it. Within a few hours of His passion, and with His eye already resting upon Calvary, resting upon the sepulchre, He exclaimed to His followers, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

And then, secondly, this idea of the world, still external, was enlarged. In the age of the Apostles, and down to the fourth century of our era, the world meant not merely the Jewish people, but the great mixed society of the Roman Empire with which the infant Church had come into contact through the preaching of the Apostles, and especially of St. Paul. If you had asked any Christian between the death of St. Stephen and the edict of Milan what "the world" meant, he would have replied: "The human beings in the Roman Empire who are outside the Church, and who are constantly engaged in persecuting it." That mighty society, in some respects the most imposing known to human history, with the Cæsar at its head and its vast army of officials, extended over the countries which lie between the Euphrates and the Straits of Gibraltar, between the Grampian Hills and the first Cataract of the Nile, though it had many other and finer aspects, which it is not now our business to consider, was indeed a wonderful and powerful embodiment of all that Scripture meant by "the world." "Would you understand the world?" a primitive Christian would have said — really did say. "Then watch our Emperor marching to the Capitol, with the kings of conquered nations in his train; then visit the gladiatorial shows in the amphitheatre, which he patronises and for which he pays; or endeavour to get an estimate of the wealth which is poured into Rome every year from every quarter of the compass to be spent in a luxury and an ostentation which know no bounds; aye, behold the Cæsar himself, who will probably, ere a few months have passed, be assassinated, but who for the time has been raised by adulation to a place among the gods, so that altars are built and incense is burnt in his honour. Mark those Prætorian Guards, who are in name his servants, but are in truth his masters, and whose fidelity depends on the money and the indulgences which they can wring out of him; and then scrutinise the countenances of the people, whose only cry day by day, month by month, year by year, is 'Bread and the public games!' Mark the crowd of philosophers, poets, parasites, men of renown, men of letters, statesmen, administrators, merchants, slaves—all of them engrossed entirely by the visible order of things around them, all of them endeavouring to extract from it some satisfaction for the desire which should lead them up to God." This was the world which St. John was thinking of when he wrote that "the whole world lieth in wickedness," and St. Paul when he dwelt on "the corruption that is in the world through lust." There were noble natures, generous and tender hearts, in that vast social fabric of old heathendom; but, taken as a whole, it was the standing antagonist of the kingdom of God, and again and again it endeavoured to crush that kingdom out of existence by mere brute force. It is noteworthy that generally speaking, the later Emperors were the most active persecutors: Marcus Aurelius, Decius, Valerian, Diocletian—they, in fact, when persecuting Christianity, represented the very essential spirit of the world over which they ruled, and when they issued their edicts, and Christians were dragged before the tribunals, and

bidden to choose between some act of idolatry and a cruel death, there was in the vast majority of cases no hesitation; faith knew her plain business, she knew her high prerogatives, and as the martyrs breathed forth their holy souls to God they conquered a system which, in killing them, believed itself to be achieving victory, and once more, when the Empire had adopted the profession of Christianity, and when, as it was said, the Cross had passed from the place of execution to the diadem of Cæsar, the world, as previously understood, might have appeared to have ceased to exist. The fact was, it had only changed its character. It dropped its outward visible form; it was now a disembodied spirit: it became a subtle, impalpable, but not less real, enemy, too often pervading the very Church which had conquered it. It reproduced on sacred soil its two great characteristics—the devotion to the visible order of things and the satisfaction of desire with created objects which had marked the old Pagan life. In Christendom, no doubt, the worldly spirit was held in check, was shamed into a sort of mock modesty, by the creed and by the lives of sincere Christians; but it took its revenge for its defeat now and then on a conspicuous scale, and Christian monarchs and Christian leaders of opinion, and even great Christian ecclesiastics, showed how powerful was the spirit of the world to drag conscience and to drag life down almost to the level at which it had been lived in Pagan days. And many earnest men thought to escape this encompassing danger by taking refuge in monasteries, where a rule of life and absolute seclusion should shut out the world that ruled so largely in the Church outside. But they did not always succeed. A change of scene is not necessarily a change of temper, and there are instances of the worldly spirit within the cloister, when ambition, or the love of power, or the love of human praise, spoilt everything that was meant for good. But here, also, faith had her triumph. On the throne, as in that great and saintly man, Lewis of France, in the cloister, in many a St. Bernard or a Thomas à Kempis, in every line of life, there were men and women who rose above the seen to the unseen, who kept desire back from eager earthly gratification that it might find its complete satisfaction in God.

My brethren, whenever there has been a real revival of religion, the separateness of the true service of Christ from the world has been insisted on, the teaching of St. John's writings has resumed its rightful moral power. So it was, to go no further back than the movement called "Evangelical," at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century; so it was with that other movement which in many respects contrasts with it, and which had its birth at Oxford fifty-seven years ago. It has been remarked that of late years this topic has fallen out of its old place in Christian preaching, and, as a consequence, in Christian practice; and, if this be the case, it is important to ask ourselves why this is the case. There are, no doubt, two reasons which make men more or less afraid of what the Bible tells us about the world. One is the dread which good men have of setting up for being better than they are or better than others are—the dread of being hypocrites or Pharisees. They have known, perhaps, or they have heard, of persons who have drawn a sharp line between themselves and worldly people, who have seemed to say, if they have not said, like some who were noted by the old prophet in a distant age: "Stand aside, for I am holier than thou." But of this there need be no fear if we follow the simple rule of applying what the Bible says on the subject, not to others, but to ourselves. Of others we may, we must, hope the best; but we may have to see whether in our thoughts, our motives, our conduct, our amusements, our standard of action, we ourselves are, or are not, falling under the censure which our Lord and His Apostles pronounced on the children of the world. For, most assuredly, the world is very near every one of us, in the lowest as well as in the highest stations of society, in the most serious as well as the most secular occupations. The poor man has his world to conquer no less than the prince, the clergyman no less truly than the layman. The fashion of these several worlds may differ; the animating principle is always the same. The force by which they one and all can only be conquered is always faith. And the second motive for recent reticence about the world is a fear lest the duties of this present state of life should be neglected if we took the language of the Gospel too literally. Depend upon it, brethren, that the true interests of man in this present state of being will really be advanced by his thinking much and very seriously of another. Human life is sweetened, it is braced, by motives which are drawn from a higher world. Simplicity, disinterestedness, care for others, indifference to personal gain or credit make those who attain to them not only the children of their Father which is in heaven, but also the salt of the earth; they save it from the moral decomposition which is ever and anon threatening to dissolve the great unwieldly mass of human society. Their toils, their tears, their prayers arrest the merely selfish impulse of men around them, and they stay the impending judgments of God. Let us be very sure that the world at large owes more than it knows or thinks to those who, living in it, have the least share of its spirit.

> There are, in this loud stunning tide
> Of human care and crime,
> With whom the melodies abide
> Of th' everlasting chime;
> Who carry music in their heart
> Through dusty lane and wrangling mart,
> Plying their daily task with busier feet
> Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.

Assuredly, brethren, we cannot with impunity neglect this, or any other element of God's revelation of His mind and will. For us at this hour the world is just as practical a topic, just as serious an opponent as it was in the days of the Apostles. It commonly presents itself to us at successive periods of life in different guises. It comes to us in early life as an attraction, I may almost say as a fascination. All the faculties of our minds and bodies are still fresh and on the alert; it toys with them one after another, addressing itself to the character of each of us with adroitness. Here it holds out the prospect of gratifying ambition, and there it discovers large opportunities of pleasure or amusement; and away yonder it veils what is really vicious or degraded beneath the conventional drapery which puts us off our guard; and in doing this it is so skilful and so persistent that we may easily forget what is due to that unseen Friend and Master, whose name we learnt in infancy from our mother, and who up to now has always had a secret place in our hearts. All looks so fair that it is difficult even to suspect the precipice that is near at hand, and on the brink of which we may find ourselves without a previous warning. In early life the world stands before us, as the smiling landlord at the door of his hotel meets the traveller, assuring us of a good entertainment and of a hearty welcome, and making no allusion to any less agreeable topic beyond; but in time the pleasantest visit comes to an end, and the bill must be paid. The Bible is more frank at the outset. "Rejoice," it says, "young man in thy youth, and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart and in the sight of thine eyes; but know that for all these things God will bring thee unto judgment." And then the world comes to us in middle life less as an attraction than as a tyranny. It brings with it a code of conduct, a body of maxims, which are often opposed to the precepts of the Gospel, but are nevertheless regarded as imperative. To stand on one's own rights, to resent injuries and insults, to make everything give way to getting on in life, to value others not by the real standard of character, but by the superficial standard of wealth or station, to make general acceptableness, and not truth, the rule of our opinions—these are some of its maxims. And it will not be trifled with. When it has once got us in its power, it keeps its eye on us. It reports any symptoms of disaffection, any lapse into high principle, with an implacable regularity; it keeps its votaries well under the despotism of ridicule; it sneers down all generous enthusiasm the moment it shows itself; it makes men who desire better things ashamed of their duties, ashamed of their principles; it makes them not seldom insincere and false in their relations with others; it betrays even into acts of inconsiderateness and cruelty; it even penetrates into the sanctuary, and it bids the Christian kneeling there consider, not what befits God's presence as the Almighty and the Eternal, not what true and simple devotion would dictate, but what other people are thinking of him, and what will be said of him if he abandons himself to the better guidance of his conscience and his heart. And in later life it often happens that the world no longer attracts or tyrannises over us from without, not because we have seen through it and bid it begone, but because it has taken possession of us, and is now not without but within us. We only do not feel its power as an attractive or an oppressive force because we breathe it as an atmosphere, because without knowing it we are already and altogether controlled by it. At each of these stages faith is the victory that overcometh the world. As St. John's language implies, to possess real faith is to be already victorious. Faith matches the world's attractiveness in early life because it can offer a real and much more powerful attraction. There is more to fascinate the human soul in the eternal beauty than in any form or ideal of earthly mould; more to interest the mind and the affections in the contemplation of the love of God than in any earthly occupation, however pleasurable or engrossing. And faith overthrows the worldly spirit in middle life. It achieves this by opening and fixing the eye of the soul upon the One Being who has a right to rule it because He is holy, just, and good. As we see him more clearly, the world loses its power; its most cherished maxims are placed in the light of His countenance, and we see how little they can really do for the improvement and happiness either of ourselves or others. And, once more, faith is equal to the hardest task of all, that of expelling the worldly spirit when, like a London fog, it has penetrated into all the recesses of our spiritual home, for faith takes us by the hand, points us to a height from which, as from the outside gallery of this church above our heads on some winter day, it can look down upon the mists in which life is buried below, and determine that it shall no longer be so. To see our Lord, the Sun of Righteousness, as He is seen by a Christian's faith is to have taken the world's measure, is to have parted company with it here and for ever.

THE *British Weekly* says that among some property lots sold at Carlisle on last Saturday week was the next and perpetual right of presentation to the perpetual curacy of Martindale, near Penrith, the income of which is £113 per annum, and which realised £350.

AT a meeting of the Hereford Board of Guardians a proposal was made that the Rev. A. Roberts, vicar of St. Peter's, be appointed chaplain at the Union, in place of the late Rev. G. B. Bennett, his predecessor at St. Peter's. It was proposed as an amendment that the paid chaplaincy be abolished, and that Episcopalian clergy and Nonconformist ministers be alike requested to perform the services gratuitously. The motion was lost by 30 votes to 16; and eventually Mr. Roberts was appointed at a salary of £50 a year.

"INCENTIVES TO CHRISTIAN LOVE."

By the Rev. J. W. KAYE, M. A., Rector of the Parish of Derrybrusk, Enniskillen.

Sermon Preached at Derrybrusk, Sunday, May 18th, 1890.

"But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore of sound mind, and be sober unto prayer: above all things being fervent in your love among yourselves; for love covereth a multitude of sins."—1. Peter iv. 7-8 (R.V.)

WHEN we remember the impulsive and unsteadfast character of Simon Bar-Jona, and contrast it with the character presented to us in this Epistle, we can only marvel at the grace and power of God which had wrought such a change in such a man. He was a man full of ardent zeal, hasty and impetuous, having great depth of feeling; but too often he displayed a thoughtlessness and fickleness which grievously marred his otherwise brave and noble qualities. Three years training with Christ, his denial of Christ, the power of Christ's resurrection upon his soul, his restoration by Christ, and the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Ghost, accomplished a change so wonderful, that we are constrained to exclaim, "It is the Lord's doing and marvellous in our eyes."

The Apostles in their early career were denounced by the Scribes and Pharisees as "unlearned and ignorant men," but in this Epistle we have the clear shining of intellectual and spiritual light, ocean depths of love and mountain heights of faith. The mind of Christ is revealed, the mystery of redemption is unfolded, and the veil of the future is uplifted for a moment upon our eager eyes. The Apostle writes to "the strangers scattered abroad," the "sojourners of the dispersion," the "elect pilgrims" of the Church of Christ, scattered into different countries; he writes to strengthen their faith, encourage their hope, and comfort their souls. They are in the midst of trials and persecutions, and they tremble with fear, "looking for the things which are coming on the earth." They need practical help and guidance, and he leads them to the true and unfailing source of consolation and deliverance. But let us remember that the light and joy of divine truth are for us also, even unto all generations. The Apostle, in our text, makes—

I.—A Solemn Announcement.—"The end of all things is at hand, etc." Our Lord Himself had used similar language in His predictions concerning the City and Temple of Jerusalem, and "the end of the world." St. Paul writing to the Christians at Rome reminded them, "knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent and the day is at hand."—Rom. xiii. 11. But in his Epistle to the Thessalonians he writes to correct their mistake in expecting the immediate return of Christ. Still St. James in his Epistle writes, "Be patient, establish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. The judge standeth before the door."—James v. 8-9. What then are we to understand by this language? 1. Is it that the end of all things, to each one personally, is at hand in the near approach of death? 2. Is it that the end of all things predicted concerning the destruction of the Jewish Temple, the Jewish Nation and the Jewish economy was near at hand? 3. Is it that the Apostles believed that the end of all things concerning the course of this world was at hand, and that Christ was soon to return to judgment and to a visible reign?

It may be that the Apostles expected the immediate destruction of the Jewish Temple and nation; and that connected with this beginning of troubles, yet more remotely connected, they expected the return of the Lord to His Kingdom and judgment. It is certainly clear from the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles that the Apostles not only lived themselves in expectation of the return of Christ, but encouraged the disciples in the same hope. That "the day of the Lord" did speedily come upon the Jewish nation, history testifies; but we are still waiting for His coming to judge the quick and the dead. The necessity for this continued waiting attitude is manifest, when we remember that according to our hopes, aspirations and expectations, so will be our character. If we wait for that which is high and holy and glorious, so shall we prepare ourselves for it; but if we are living without God and without hope in the world, we may sink deeper and deeper into the pit of darkness and despair. Again, the Apostle gives—

II.—An Urgent Admonition.—"Be ye therefore of sound mind, and be sober unto prayer; above all things being fervent in your love among yourselves." The coming "end of all things" was an obvious and powerful argument for the Apostle's urgent admonition. The Lord Himself had foretold the troublous times which would precede and be a sign of the day of wrath upon Judah and Jerusalem; and that generation would not pass away before "the end" of those things predicted should be fulfilled. This would be a time of great sorrow, and Christians would become the victims of intolerance, animosity and bitter persecution; but he that endured to the end should be saved. Saint Peter knew well how necessary it was to admonish the followers of Christ to be prepared for the perils that were before them. 1. They would need a "sound mind." They must be temperate, discreet under all circumstances; not impulsive, fickle or fanatical. 2. They would need to be "sober unto prayer"; vigilant but circumspect. They were not unnecessarily to obtrude their religious devotions upon the sight of others; neither

were they to court persecution. They were not, like the Pharisees, to make long prayers at the corners of the streets to be seen of men. They must in their prayers and devotions act soberly, with perfect self-control; without excitement or disorderly notoriety. The Apostle does not admonish them to pray; he takes it for granted that they do pray; but he is anxious that their prayers should be offered in a right spirit and on suitable occasions; and that their minds and thoughts should be calm, collected and free from distraction. 3. They would need "above all things" brotherly kindness, fervent Christian love, among themselves.

There is a peculiarity in Christian love—love which true Christians ought to have among themselves. We may love a man that is a Jew, a Mahometan, a Parsee or a Brahmin, but as Christians, we ought to love Christians with a deeper, holier and more peculiar love. Christians stand in a high and holy relation to each other; they have one God their Father, one Lord their Redeemer, one Spirit their Sanctifier; they have one hope, one faith, one common Salvation; they are all "one body," of which Christ is the Head, and they are all members one of another.

As Christians are all children of one Father, they have a family union and spiritual affinity, with which others must not interfere. They are all one in and through Christ their Saviour; the fulness of the Father's love flows through Him, pulsing rapturously through every believer's soul. Thus they are made partakers of the Divine nature, sanctified by the Spirit, accepted in the Beloved, and heirs of an eternal weight of glory. O fellow Christians, children of God through Christ Jesus, what blessedness is yours! Therefore, above all things, have fervent love among yourselves.

Further the Apostle supplies—

III.—A Most Worthy Motive.—"For love covereth a multitude of sins." That word "love," or charity, belongs alone to the Christian vocabulary; the ancient world that boasted of strength and prowess and victory knew not the Christian word for love. Among the Christian graces St. Paul exalts charity—above all "the greatest of these is charity." In the exercise of pure and perfect Christian love we approach nearest God, for God is love. God, by love, covers the magnitude of our sins, and we, by love, are required to cover the sins of our Christian brethren. In these words of our text, St. Peter makes a quotation from the book of Proverbs (x. 12), where it is written, "Hatred stirreth up strifes; but love covereth all sins." Love to God and love to man, form the basis of the Mosaic code, but Christianity exemplifies and fulfils it. Christians are admonished to have fervent love among themselves, because love covereth a multitude of sins. We may cover many sins, 1, by forgiving them; 2, by giving them no unnecessary publicity; 3, by putting the best possible interpretation upon offences; 4, by giving no occasions of offence ourselves. When God forgives, no spot or mark is left behind; but when man forgives he seldom forgets, and "though the wound be cured the scar remaineth." And though we may hide an offence from the world, we cannot hide it from God; yet by covering the sin before men, we may bring the sinner, by repentance, back to God. By putting the best construction upon offences we may avoid, in a great measure, "the beginning of strife, which is like the letting out of waters;" and contentions may be ended instead of being perpetuated. Charity thinketh no evil, imputes no motive, but forgives. By giving no occasion of offence, using no provocation, and repressing all bitter feelings, in ourselves and in the hearts of others, we shall be enabled to promote peace and concord, and in the true Spirit of Christian love, we shall be enabled to cover a crowd of grievous sins.

Christian love has its fountain and source in the infinite fulness of the eternal Father, flowing forth with immeasurable beneficence through Jesus Christ, into the hearts of His faithful followers. In love, He left the throne of His Father's glory, took upon Him our nature, and died a sacrifice for our sins; but He shall come again in power and majesty to judge the quick and the dead, and then shall the end come. If we are His disciples, let us be of sound mind, discreet and faithful in our devotions; and above all let us be full of love among ourselves, and ready to forgive a multitude of sins. Now is the time of our trial, the time for faith and patience and love; let us pray without ceasing, let us wrestle and struggle on; soon the Lord will appear, and the white robe, the golden sceptre, and the jewelled crown shall be ours. And there shall be no more death and no more sin.

The Rev. A. M. Norman, rector of Burnmoor, near Fence Houses, and Hon. Canon of Durham Cathedral, has been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society.

Schinos.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s. 9d., six months, 5s. 6d., twelve months, 10s. 10d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXVIII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1890.

INCUMBENT AND CURATE.

THERE are few conditions of existence so varied in nature and so little defined as the relationship of an incumbent to any of his assistant clergy. This relationship, under present conditions, seems to be dependent entirely upon the individual tendencies of the persons concerned; if, on the one hand, the Vicar or Rector is a man of overbearing disposition, and his subordinate is of a weak or nervous temperament, the latter becomes an absolute slave—his whole existence lies in the will of his superior, and his whole hope is that of complying with the exorbitant demands of the man to whose parish he is licensed. On the other hand, it often occurs that a good-natured but inexperienced vicar becomes a prey to the ambitious designs of some not over-scrupulous curate, and, ere long, becomes in constant dread of what he will do. These two conditions, though so strikingly divergent in nature are, nevertheless, the state of affairs which exists in the majority of cases. Surely some more definite *locus standi* should be laid down for the nineteenth century curate, so that he may at least know what his rights and privileges are, and that he may be prevented from overstepping the bounds of his sphere. It seems to us that there ought to be infinitely more definiteness in the tenure of curacies. On the one hand, a curate may be dismissed without any good cause, and a man who for a considerable period has been labouring with most satisfactory results, may lose his post either from caprice or jealousy on the part of his incumbent. It often occurs, however, that a man of worthless character, by stratagems known principally to men of this class, is enabled to defy the notice given him, and to remain a fixture in the parish. These conditions surely should be rectified. But how? We would certainly give to the curate a more satisfactory position, but it is equally necessary to protect the vicar of the parish against the danger he runs of his curates coming for a short time and then running away from him. Some course of action seems called for which could combine these two requirements. The curate, and most assuredly senior curates, should have some sort of a freehold in the Church, whilst that freehold should carry with it restrictions such as should tend to make the curacy more and more permanent. We feel, too, that in case of dispute between incumbent and curate, there should be some authority who should be capable of deciding the matter without the usual severance which at present seems the unavoidable concomitant of a divergency of opinion between rector and curate. One of the saddest phases of clerical life is often that of the frequent disputes existing between the clergy of parishes, which tend so materially to damage the cause of Christ and of the Church. Much of this might be put a stop to were there something of a more definite nature in the relationship of the incumbent and his assistant clergy.

LUX MUNDI.

BY THE REV. PREBENDARY TILNEY BASSETT, M.A., VICAR OF DULVERTON.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE DUNSTER CLERICAL ASSOCIATION ON JUNE 10TH, 1890.

THERE is nothing very surprising in a peal of thunder, but when it comes out of a clear sky. Horace tells us that such an unwonted prodigy turned him from being a devotee of the Epicurean philosophy to recognise the providence of the gods, and their interest and interference in the affairs of men. So we may say of the book which is creating such a stir in the religious world at the present time, that there is nothing really remarkable in the volume, whether we consider the group of essays separately or collectively, as all that is advanced in these pages has been advanced before, and that, too, more fully and more forcibly; but when we remember the quarter from whence this thunderbolt has issued, the matter is different, it assumes the aspect of the marvellous. Speaking amongst brethren who, probably without exception, would have a strong sympathy with the Catholic movement, it is a startling fact that in the "House" that was so lately founded for the express purpose of perpetuating the "faith once for all delivered to the saints," and preserving the traditions of the Church, such an explosion of rationalistic and Socinian heresies should find vent, and send its vibrations to the furthermost borders of Christendom. Had the manifesto been put forth by those who applaud the wildest excesses of private judgment, or by those who hold up to ridicule the necessity of a lawfully transmitted ministry, or by those who regard the definitions of the creeds as

fetters of an obsolete bondage, we should not have been seized with astonishment; but it is passing strange that those who deny the validity of presbyterian orders and unchurch the communities founded by Luther and his abettors, and relegate such ministers and their ministerial acts to the uncovenanted mercies of God, should go to that very manufactory to equip themselves with the weapons of so-called criticism to assail the doctrines of the Church of God. I pass no opinion on the present occasion upon the merits of these ecclesiastical questions, but it is an anomaly, we must all confess, to see High Church Anglicans go a-shopping to Germany and Holland to get their outfit for an expedition against the ancient creed of Christendom.

The book under our consideration contains twelve essays by eleven different writers, one contributor having supplied two papers. These gentlemen are all graduates of Oxford, with the exception of one, who took his degree at Cambridge, but was afterwards incorporated into the University of Oxford; they are all under the solemn obligation of priests' orders; they hold prominent positions, and most of them have secured already a name for ability and knowledge.

Oxford has a fame superior to the sister seat of learning for raising alarms in the Church by firing off from time to time volleys of such literary combinations. Sixty years ago the celebrated "Tracts for the Times" aroused many from slumber, some to follow and some to fight against the leaders of that movement, and thirty years ago the notorious "Essays and Reviews" inaugurated a movement in the direction of free thought, and made many tremble for the Ark of God. It may be unfair even to suggest a comparison between the latter volume and the one now before us, as the "Essays and Reviews" were an undisguised attack upon orthodoxy, and *Lux Mundi*, at all events, whatever the effect of the book may prove to be, claims to sustain the character of a champion of the creed. There is, however, one external feature in which they stand in striking contrast—a feature which tends much to weaken the effect of the one and to strengthen the conclusions of the other. The writers of "Essays and Reviews" did not set up as a company with even a limited liability among themselves, but openly stated that each was solely answerable for the product of his own pen, and had no necessary coherence or connection with his fellows, or responsibility for their opinions, except so far as a common binding associated them between two covers, and a continued pagination suggested the extension of kindred thoughts and purposes; but this compilation comes before the world with an open confession of personal communication between the authors. The editor makes the statement that they "have not written as mere individuals, but as ministers under common conditions of a common faith," and that the "volume is the expression of a common mind and a common hope." The common object which this band of essayists had in view may be briefly summed up in their own words. They felt compelled "to attempt to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems"; hence this "collection of essays represents an attempt on behalf of the Christian Creed in the way of explanation." The authors have not written "as guessers at truth, but as servants of the Catholic Creed and Church." "Theology must take a new development;" development is not innovation;" "it is not heresy," but "rather the process in which the Church, standing firm in her old truths, enters into the apprehension of the new social and intellectual movements of each age." "To such a development these studies attempt to be a contribution." Such is, I think, a fair statement of the problem these theologians have set themselves the task of solving. The subjects chosen for the purpose are, as we have already said, twelve in number, namely:—Faith; The Christian doctrine of God; The problem of Pain—its bearing on faith in God; The preparation in history for Christ; The Incarnation in relation to Development; The Incarnation as the basis of Dogma; The Atonement; The Holy Spirit and Inspiration; The Church; The Sacraments; Christianity and Politics; and Christian Ethics.

Although the subject allotted us is the entire collection of the essays, we presume we are right in our surmise that the focus-point of interest centres in the essay by the editor, Mr. Gore, the head of Pusey House, "On the Holy Spirit and Inspiration"; and not so much in the whole compass of this essay as in certain passages in it which touch upon the origin and history, and, consequently, the value of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the weight which our Lord's testimony bears when quoting these Scriptures in His public teaching.

But before entering upon these questions, one great literary blemish is conspicuous in this essay, and, it may be said, in all the rest of the collection—I mean the omission of any statement or account of the history of what is called the "Higher Criticism," which, it is presumable, has met with favour with all the contributors to the volume. It seems to be taken for granted that the readers of *Lux Mundi* will be already well posted in all the theories of the last hundred years, which have now found their climax in the writings of Kuenen and Wellhausen, Driver, Cheyne, Robertson Smith and others; but we are left in the dark as to the system which is advocated by the essayists, and, presumably, opposed to the current traditions of the Church. There are two serious misconceptions likely to arise from this omission. The first is that many readers are dragged into the presence of difficulties and abstruse discussions when quite unprepared and off their guard; and, secondly, those who are acquainted with the heretical advances of the last century, both on the Continent and in our own country, do not know how far these writers—and Mr. Gore in particular—have subscribed to their tenets. In admitting some points of their system do their writings prove, do they admit all the rest which are not referred to explicitly? We may, on the one hand, be unfair to the essayists who write in concord in charging them with too close an alliance with the destructive critics; or we may, on the other, be too lenient to them in our judgment, and so sell the truth in our endeavour to save its assailants.

At all events, it shall be our task to trace the history of this movement, and then to select references in the essay which seem to comply with or endorse the opinions enunciated by the long *catena* of impugners of the faith.

It will be remembered that the present attack is directed against the Old Testament. A like assault was raised by the Tubingen School some years ago against the New Testament. It was argued that all the books of the New Testament were the product of the second century at the earliest, and showed what they called a "tendency" either to the side of Peter or Paul, who were regarded by them as bitter antagonists;

and the various books of the New Testament were intended by their respective writers—whoever they might be—to be a species of Eirenicon, or *modus vivendi*, among Christians. The leaders of this party demanded that the Bible should be treated as any other ancient book that might be preserved to our times. Hitherto this procedure had been considered a profane position to take with reference to a collection of writings that had come down to us with so many proofs of their divinity, both external and internal; but certain leading men at Cambridge, of whom the lamented Bishop Lightfoot may, without invidiousness, be called the chief, took up the challenge, and the result is well known, notwithstanding Mrs. Humphry Ward's reiteration of the opposite, that the enemies of the faith were thoroughly beaten with their own weapons and driven from the field of their own selecting. A similar attack is now being made against the Old Testament, and we trust will meet with a similar fate.

We shall endeavour to supply the deficit, and to lay before you the briefest account of the history of the controversy. The first assault advanced against the Old Testament Scriptures may be relegated to the Early Gnostics, who, strange to say, though not a party in the Church, but rather a cancer or tumour that fastened on the body of the Church, have transmitted mischief, like blood-poisoning, through after generations, and the ill results are even now coming to the surface. The Gnostics taught that the Old Testament had no connection with the New; that they had separate authors; that the God of the one was not the God of the other, and that the Old Testament was contrary to the New. Here were the seeds of multiform error to develop growth in after times.

The first definite germ, however, of the present phase of the controversy is traceable to Aben-Ezra, in the twelfth century. He is well known as one of the greatest of Jewish commentators. He was not distinctively a Rationalist, but he uttered unguarded sayings, and just as in the case of Augustine respecting the adoration of angels in the early Church, and Luther respecting the inspiration of certain books at the Reformation period, the unwise sayings of the wise ofttimes have been more productive of error in after ages than their better utterances of good. Carlstadt, who flourished in the beginning of the sixteenth century, at once the colleague and the rival of Luther, was the first openly to deny that Moses was the author of the books that bear his name.

The name of Hobbes is painfully familiar to the English ear. He was a standard-bearer among the assailants of the Scriptures, and through a long life chiefly embraced by the seventeenth century was a bitter enemy of Revelation. He maintained the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

About the same period lived Benedict de Spinoza, a Portuguese Jew, a Cartesian philosopher, and the founder of modern Pantheism. His system and personal history are well known. By emphasising what he esteemed to be difficulties and contradictions in the Mosaic writings, he concluded that Moses was the author of only portions of the Pentateuch, and that the collection, as it now stands, was the work probably of Ezra—certainly of some late Redactor. He denied the possibility of miracle and of prophecy, and, in short, of a divine revelation altogether. He may be regarded as the lineal ancestor of the rationalists of our day. But it was not till the middle of the eighteenth century that these attacks assumed an exact and definite form; they were more carpings against, than criticisms of, the sacred text. This unenviable task was taken up by Astruc, who was a Frenchman by birth, a Roman Catholic by creed, and a physician by profession. It had been pointed out that the names of God—Elohim and Jehovah—are distinct in use in Genesis and the first five chapters of Exodus. This feature he worked out into a system, inferring that this difference in the divine names was a proof of different authorship and separate traditions. This quondam physician carried his diagnosis so far as to trace *ten* sources in the compilation of the Pentateuch. This is what is called among critics the *Documentary Hypothesis*. In the early part of this century Vater and Hartmann introduced a "rider" to the above theory, which has received the name of the *Fragmentary Hypothesis*. This holds that the Pentateuch is a combination of loose pieces patched together, just as some critics tell us was the rhapsodic origin of Homer's Iliad; but this dream in turn gave place to the *Supplementary Hypothesis*, that the Elohistic author framed the basis of the work, and the Jehovist added glosses and notes of his own, and moulded the results into one whole. This system has been subdivided into countless branches. De Wette attributed the first four books to the Elohist and Jehovist, but Deuteronomy to an author distinct from both. Stähelin asserted the identity of the Jehovist and Deuteronomist. Hupfeld traced three authors in Genesis. But Ewald outstripped all his predecessors. He recognised seven authors in the Pentateuch and Joshua, dating some respectively in the times of Samson, Solomon, Elijah, and Joel. Deuteronomy saw the light in the reign of Manasseh, and the blessing of Moses in the days of Jeremiah. Graf has the unenviable claim of starting the more recent theories that have found favour. He post-dated the fundamental document to the time after the return from the Babylonist captivity; all the rest are merely additions; so that the laws of Israel, moral and ceremonial, are the inventions of a comparatively modern period. This at last brings us to the theory dominant in our day. The last-named suggestion of Graf's has been seized on and adopted, in the main, by Kuenen and Wellhausen. Their works have been translated, and are having a considerable circulation in our country, and the more advanced of the Rationalistic school are greedily adopting their views. The chief features of this system are, in a few words, that Joshua must be added to the five books of Moses (so called), and the collection named the Hexateuch, though no Jew nor Christian ever dreamt of such a classification, as the Law always held a superlative superiority, and Joshua was known as the first of the "Former prophets." This Hexateuch is divisible into three parts—the ground work, or priestly code; the Jehovistic portions, and Deuteronomy. The Jehovistic portion is the oldest, and belongs to the period which preceded the dissolution of the two kingdoms by the Assyrians. Deuteronomy was the joint work of King Josiah and the High Priest Hilkiah. In plain words that book was not found by those worthies, but forged to meet a national crisis. The priestly code, which contains Leviticus and portions of Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, is the latest of all, and belongs to the post-exilic times. When these were put together a preface was needed, and the earlier chapters of Genesis, containing the creation and origin of man, were struck off for the purpose, and all was edited and arranged in the year 444 B.C. To complete the sketch,

as predictive prophecy is impossible according to these critics, Isaiah must be divided into two parts, the former portion being by Isaiah, the latter portion, consisting of the last twenty-seven chapters, by someone else. The name of Cyrus in chapter xliv. shows that this composition must have been written after his edict had been published. Professor Driver goes so far as to say that "Isaiah's visions, in their literal sense, never were realised, and, we may safely add, they never can be realised in the future" ("Isaiah, Life and Times," p. 111). Daniel was the product of the year 165 B.C. at the earliest, as the great persecutor, Antiochus Epiphanes, whose career is delineated by this writer, died the year before. The Hagiographa are all post-exilic. Even the Psalms—David is no longer the sweet psalmist of Israel, but some unknowns have appropriated his name, and the traditions of his poetical and musical talents.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,—Sometimes disputants make admissions unwittingly. "C. C., V.-G." maintains that the literal and plain (as he calls it) interpretation of the Book of Jonah must be correct, because our Lord plainly spoke of it as historic fact. When I point out that, according to this "plain" way of reading the Scriptures, the "other gods" of Deut. xxx. 17, must be accepted as having a real existence, "C. C., V.-G." suggests a gloss on that passage ten times as outrageous as the parabolic reading of Jonah. But our Lord did not, that we can be sure of, speak of Jonah as a real historic person. The reason given, that the resurrection, typified by the casting up of Jonah, was real and historical, and therefore that the type must have been the same, is not a reason at all; for if it be sound, then there can be no such thing as a type that differs at all from what is typified. Besides, we know that our Lord did rise from the dead "by many infallible proofs;" no such proofs existing concerning Jonah.

However, I do not so much object to "C. C., V.-G.'s" notions of the interpretation of Scripture as to his manner of attacking those who differ from him. He tells your readers in one letter that those clergy who teach differently from him violate their subscriptions. When I reprove him for this, he says "all he meant was" so and so, not at all what he did actually say. He compares himself to St. Paul, who, however, so far as I am acquainted with his epistles and the Book of Acts, never spoke disrespectfully of St. Peter, but "withstood him to the face," which is quite something else. He uses expressions not suitable to the subject under discussion. "Going to the wall," as he applies that term, and "Cinderella," remind me of nothing so much as Mr. Huxley's magazine articles against the Christian religion, which were generally considered to have reached a considerable depth of vulgarity. I object, further, to "C. C., V.-G." making his own want of apprehension of the meanings of words into an argument. If he cannot see that a parable and a fable are not the same, others can see it. Not to press this, I will call Jonah allegorical. If "C. C., V.-G." cannot see a difference between allegory and fable, he must set Johnson's Dictionary at defiance.

In conclusion, I may mention that the allegorical reading of the Book of Jonah is not new, as your correspondent thinks; it is only new to him. I believe it is as old as the seventeenth, if not the sixteenth, century.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

EVOLUTION.

SIR,—Though Mr. Evans' last letter proves the truth of my statement that it is well-nigh impossible to convince an anti-Evolutionist, I will, nevertheless, try to make my assertions a little plainer.

1. The quadrumana, as we know them, are represented by the existing baboons, apes, etc. Man does not belong to that family, but has one assigned all to himself alone. Both existing apes and man have descended from a common ancestor, which was neither ape nor man. The letter Y will represent the differentiations. The tops of the branches stand for man and apes; the branches their respective ancestry, while the stem is the common ancestor. The length of the branches represents the length of time as well; and the longer they are, the wider becomes the distance between their summits, and the greater the differences between man and apes. This illustration will show that man has nothing whatever to do with apes and baboons, for they have long ago gone off on their own account. Hence man could not possibly have been descended from any ape or baboon, or from anything like them. When Mr. Darwin says the common ancestor belonged to the quadrumana, he doubtless meant that it was quadrumanous; for as no trace of the creature has ever been found, it is impossible to state positively whether it could have been placed in any existing family or not. One might, on exactly the same grounds, assume that it belonged to the genus *Homo*. The evidence, however, for the former existence of the common ancestor is simply overwhelming to any impartial observer of facts.

2. With regard to fertile hybrids, I presume Mr. Evans is acquainted with fuschias, rhododendrons, calceolarias, pelargoniums, gloxinias, petunias, chrysanthemums, orchids, roses, etc., etc. If he is, he is evidently not aware that he enjoys the beauties of perfectly fertile hybrids.

3. Mr. Evans asks for a definition of a "species." Here is one I always give when lecturing on classification of plants: "A species is known by a collection of constant characters, which may be taken from any parts of a plant." It is thus, *e.g.*, that the field buttercups are known from the creeping aquatic and other species. Perhaps he will now "define" the limits of a species as soon as it begins to vary under cultivation?

4. Because a man may be now, intellectually, what Shakespeare describes him to be, this is no argument, either for or against, what he might have been before the existing quadrumana were differentiated, any more than such a description would apply to the Fijians or other savages. Indeed there was a time when the present writer, as well as Mr. Evans himself, could only utter inarticulate sounds, perhaps not unlike those of their common and yet undifferentiated hairy quadrumanous ancestor. Yet now they can even argue for and against evolution respectively!

GEORGE HENSLOW.

JUDGE WARREN'S PAMPHLET.

SIR,—The letter of the reviewer of Judge Warren's pamphlet, in your paper of 17th May, contained bad grammar before it reached the printer. Your correspondent asks me on what ground the Privy Council gave judgment in the Gorham case. I told your correspondent what the judgment was, and I was correct. He mixes up in his mind the judgment and its grounds, which are different things. What is important is the effect of the judgment; and the effect is, that no person who holds the Gorham doctrine of Baptism can be excluded from Church preferment for holding the doctrine.

Your reviewer "still maintains the same," viz., that the Church allows no other sense, etc. "There is no meaning possible but mine." Other persons who understand as much of the subject as your reviewer think that other meanings are possible. Whether so or not, the point of interest is, what meanings are allowable; and the Privy Council has decided, in the case above, that a meaning different from that which your reviewer prefers is allowable. He may rail at the Privy Council as much as he likes, like other seditious persons, lay and clerical. He says again that the Church has decided what she allows and what disallows. I contradict this. The interpretation of the Liturgy Articles, etc., belongs not to the Church, but to the Courts of Law. Judicially, the Church has no power to decide anything; and so it must be in any country where there is perfect religious liberty.

I said in my last letter that a very great diversity on all points of doctrine must be permissible, which remark your reviewer comments on as if I said an *unlimited diversity* to the extent, he suggests, of Atheism. If your reviewer were worth complaining of, I would complain of this unfairness; but I really think he does not mean to be unfair, but is dense enough to think that he makes a proper comment.

I have to assure him that every remark of his on the Romish *opus operatum* teaching on the Sacraments but illustrates his ignorance of what that teaching is. A critic who uses bad grammar, who does not know what a legal judgment is, who cites authorities that he never read, and who is positive in proportion to his want of knowledge of his subject, is not competent to review a book, or a pamphlet, or even a tract in one syllable.

16th June. B.

ON Thursday, the 12th inst., the Bishop of Ely presided over a synod of the beneficed clergy of the diocese in the south transept of the Cathedral. They had been summoned for the election of a Proctor in Convocation, to succeed the late Canon Hopkins, of Littleport. There has been an active canvass of the diocese during the last few weeks, but as one of the candidates had withdrawn, the proceedings at the election were merely formal. Dr. Cunningham proposed, and Canon Cockshott seconded, the Rev. Francis Slater, of St. Giles's, Cambridge, who has spent many years in the diocese, first as master of the grammar-school at Sudbury, and subsequently as vicar of an important district in Cambridge. As no other proposal was made the Bishop declared Mr. Slater duly elected, and after he had addressed the electors, and a vote of condolence with the family of the late Proctor had been passed, the proceedings terminated.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Blythe, Rev. Robert, Vicar of Ogbourne St. George, Wilts.

Burn, Rev. William Pelham, M.A., Curate of St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington; Vicar of St. Peter's, Mancroft, Norwich.

Cooper, Rev. F. W., M.A., Rector of Lonbridge Deverill, Wilts.

Dickson, Rev. R. Bruce, M.A., Vicar of Cadmore, Bucks; Vicar of Stewkley, Bucks.

Dighton, Rev. C. E., Vicar of Maisemore; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Gloucestershire (Mr. J. Roberts West).

Fell, Rev. James, Curate of Christ Church, West Hartlepool; Assistant Chaplain of the Mersey Mission to Seamen at Liverpool.

Frome-Wilkinson, Rev. John, M.A.. Vicar of Cotham, Notts.

Hall, Rev. W. J., M.A., Curate of Epsom, Surrey; Rector of Langtree, Devonshire.

Hamlyn, Rev. W., B.A., Curate of St. Leonard's-on-Sea Parish Church; Rector of St. Paul's, Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Hunt, Rev. W. H., Assistant Secretary to the Church Army.

Jacques, Rev. W. B., M.A., Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Hulme; Vicar of St. John's, Whittle-le-Woods, Chorley.

Kynaston, Rev. William Herbert, B.A., Curate; Vicar of Annesley, Notts.

Lewis, Rev. T. C., Curate-in-Charge of East Harnham, near Salisbury; Rector of Dodbrooke, Devonshire.

Little, Rev. H., Chaplain to the Forces at Fulwood, Preston.

Mactaggart, Rev. John, Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class.

Rickard, Rev. Herbert, M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Lozells, Birmingham; Assistant District Secretary, A.C.S., Northern Province.

Roberts, Rev. A., M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Hereford; Chaplain to the Hereford Union.

Rogers, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Bexwell, Norfolk.

Shimfield, Rev. William Henry, Vicar of Haddenham, Ely.

Slater, Rev. Francis, Vicar of St. Giles's, Cambridge; Proctor in Convocation for the Diocese of Ely, and Hon. Canon of Ely.

Thomas, Rev. Arthur Frank, B.A., Perpetual Curate of Wincle, Cheshire.

Vandeleur, Rev. Gerald O., M.A., Rector of Ravenstone, Derbyshire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bernau, Rev. John Henry, late Vicar of Belvedere, and formerly of the C.M.S. in British Guiana, at 12, Elms-road, Clapham, on the 14th inst., aged 84.

Boyce, Rev. Thomas White, late Rector of St. Werburgh's, Bristol, at Clapham, on the 12th inst., aged 77.

Calvert, Rev. William, Vicar of St. Peter's, Dulwich-common, on the 13th inst., aged 67.

King, Rev. Frank Bowes, M.A., six years Curate and thirty-eight years Vicar of Burstwick, at the Vicarage, Burstwick, near Hull, on the 19th ult., aged 67.

Leech, Rev. Arthur H., M.A., Dean of Cashel, at the Deanery, Cashel, on the 10th ult., aged 73.

Oakley, Rev. John, Dean of Manchester, sometime Dean of Carlisle, and formerly Vicar of St. Saviour's, Hoxton, at Deganwy, Llandudno, on the 10th inst., aged 55.

Reynolds, Rev. Osborne, formerly of Debach, and late Rector of Rockland St. Mary, at Clipston Rectory, on the 7th inst., aged 76.

Rynd, Rev. Henry Nassau, twenty-three years Vicar of Shinfield, Reading, at Shinfield Vicarage, on the 4th inst., aged 69.

Tower, Rev. Charles, Hon. Canon of Salisbury, formerly Rector of Chilmark, Wilts, at Avondale, Bathford, on the 12th inst., aged 75.

Yonge, Rev. John Eyre, Rector of Hempstead-c.-Lessingham, and formerly Assistant Master at Eton College, at Hempstead Rectory, on the 11th inst. aged 72.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE EARLIEST MISSIONARY ORGANISATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.*

By the Most Rev. CHARLES PARSONS REICHEL, D.D., D.Lit., Bishop of Meath.

Sermon Preached in St. Stephen's Church, Dublin, on Sunday, April 27, 1890, on behalf of the Society for the Pr pagation of the Gospel.

"Is there not a cause?"—1 Samuel xvii. 29.

As I am requested to appeal to you to-day on behalf of the oldest Missionary Society of our Church, or indeed, of Protestantism in general, I have thought it might not be without advantage if I reviewed the missionary work of the earliest Church, especially as connected with a weighty argument for the truth of our religion. In aid of our inquiries, a late discovery in a library at Constantinople has brought to light a remarkable little book: a book which, though referred to by several of the early Fathers, had so completely disappeared, that its ever having existed had been questioned by the sceptical spirit of the age. The book I allude to is called "The Teaching of Christ to the Gentiles through the Twelve Apostles;" and it purports to be a manual of essential Christian doctrine, and a specification of Christian practice, so far as Christian worship and the dissemination of Christianity are concerned. The first of these it certainly is not; but it does throw great light on the early propagation of Christianity.

In conducting my argument, I must be allowed to avail myself of a well-known legal principle. This principle is, that "possession is nine points of the law." Now, *Christianity is in possession.* It is a great fact in the history of man. This must be taken into account by those who impugn its authority. Instead of being required to show that Christianity is true, I may reasonably challenge its adversaries to show that it is false. The burden of proof lies in reality with its assailants, not with its defenders.† And this most reasonable retort is all the more justified, because Christianity has done a certain work in the history of man, quite separate ftom the eternal hopes which it holds out; is doing a certain work at this very moment of the most beneficial kind. To what is the abolition of slavery in all civilized countries due? Unquestionably to Christianity. The men who in the last century fought out its abolition did so, not on the strength of mere morality, but on the ground of Christian principle. To what is the present high position of the female sex, on which depends the whole future of the human race, to be ascribed? Still more absolutely to Christianity, and to Christianity alone. We know what women were in the highest civilization of antiquity: to what further degradation a philosopher like Plato would have consigned them: what they are at this day in all countries which are not Christian. What nations know anything of freedom and of the dignity which always accompanies freedom, and cannot be had without it? Only those where Christianity rules, or has ruled, even when its authority is now shaken, in consequence of the corruptions of the Church. In what countries is the family a sacred and, therefore, a happy thing? In Christian countries only, if the family is taken in its ideal sense, though I grieve to say that there is one country, generally called Christian, though making no official profession of Christianity, no provision for its maintenance, where the laxity and inconsistency of the marriage laws threaten to destroy the very essence of family life.* Do you think, in the face of these facts, that the world would be wiser and happier if Christianity were gone? that the loss of its assurances, of its sanctities, of its consolations, would make men better than they now are? that they would find stronger inducements to virtue, stronger deterrents from vice, in being certified that God, if indeed there be a God, cares nothing for them; that there is nothing to hope or fear beyond the grave? that death is an eternal sleep? You know the horrors that were enacted just a century ago by the men who set up that inscription over every burial-ground in France: do they encourage you to adopt their creed?

But to return to my thesis. Christianity is unquestionably a great fact in the history of the world, and in the development of the most advanced portions of the human race. It is a fact which must be accounted for as must all other facts; the mind of man is irresistibly driven, when

* This Sermon is published in a separate form by William McGee, of Dublin, and by Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton & Co., of London.

† This principle, viz., that the burden of proof rests with those who attack, not with those who defend, existing institutions, is valid in politics as well as in religion, and in both has been equally forgotten. In modern politics we are constantly met with the question: "What can you say in defence of this or that social arrangement?—of this or that established institution?" (an Established Church, for instance). The question ought rather to be: "What have you to say *against* it?" It cannot have come into existence without some adequate cause; does that cause no longer give reason for maintaining it?

The neglect of this very obvious principle strongly tends to *Nihilism*, which is merely the ultimate result of that impatience with existing institutions, and ardour for novelties which characterise the present age.

* The United States.

it sees effects, to seek for causes. It came into existence quite suddenly within a very short space of time, within less than four years from the beginning of Christ's activity; it made its way, in spite of its Founder having been put to an ignominious death; it made its way in spite of all the prejudices of the races to which it was first presented, and which prejudices it assiduously flouted; for, if it preached a Messiah to the Jews, it preached Him not as a triumphant conqueror, but as a crucified victim; if it preached immortality to the Greeks, it preached it not in the shape of the immortality of the soul, but in the shape of the resurrection of the body, which seemed to them absurd. It owed nothing to force, for its first preachers were poor, persecuted, powerless; it had everything to dread from force, for it never became a "*religio licita*" in the Roman Empire, till it had actually more than half conquered that empire. During its first 300 years it might at any moment be proceeded against with the almost despotic power vested in every proconsul and proprætor; it went directly in the teeth of the ethics of the age, for it sternly forbade indulgences which everybody then thought perfectly allowable, and the outspoken and quite innocent mention of which in the classics of Greece and Rome, constitutes the greatest danger connected with their study. If it dwelt on the unity of God, a sublime idea familiar to the best heathen minds, it represented that unity as compatible with the associating a human being with the Godhead, even in the very act of worship, and that human being a crucified malefactor. All these are difficulties which, the more they are reflected on, the more enormous do they appear, and which certainly require all the more strength in the causes that overcame them.

When, therefore, we are glibly told that the triumph of Christianity was quite natural; that the whole affair, considered as a supernatural Revelation, was a delusion, and that mankind are so prone to delusions that they were only too eager to embrace this strange system, so completely opposed to their prejudices, their passions, their philosophies, without any real ground whatever for it; and that not merely its first preachers, who can have had no motive for spreading it except that they believed it to be true, but thousands besides them, and after them, were quite ready to face death in some of its most appalling forms, as well as the previous horrors of "the question," and all for a mere delusion;—when unbelievers expect us to swallow such a statement as being perfectly adequate to account for the existence of Christianity, and the part it has played in history, it appears to me that they are counting on the credulity or the unreflectingness of those whom they address, to a degree which is by no means complimentary. Like everything else, Christianity must have had a *cause*; and that cause must have been an *adequate* cause; and further, I must observe, that if its first preachers appealed to causes inadequate or even positively false, and which, being false, it would have been easy to show up as being false—*e.g.*, miracles, said to have been performed all through Palestine in broad daylight and in the presence of great multitudes; but which miracles had never been performed at all—they were simply making their own case desperate, and giving their cause bound hand and foot into the hands of its enemies, to be easily exposed and utterly destroyed. For there was abundance of intercourse between Palestine and the neighbouring countries where the Gospel was first preached, especially between Palestine and great commercial centres like Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome; and nothing would be easier than to inquire of persons who had recently come from Palestine whether the reports brought by the earliest preachers of Christianity concerning what Christ had done were true. These things "had not been done in a corner;" if they were true, they must have been notorious. If, therefore, persons freshly arrived from Palestine proved, on inquiry, to know nothing about them, the falsehood of the Apostles' statements concerning them would at once have been evident, and the whole system based on them would have been discredited.

And in connection with this, let me call your attention to a fact well known, but very imperfectly comprehended. It is the fact that whereas at the very beginning of its career Christianity made thousands of converts from among the Jews, after the lapse of a century it entirely ceased to make converts from among them. In other words, that its Jewish converts were made at the time when the activity of Jesus was most recent, and, of course, freshest in people's recollection, and that Christianity ceased to make Jewish converts when the immediate recollection of Christ's activity had died out with the death of the generation that had seen Him. Now, had Christ's miracles—those mighty works on the strength of which He claimed obedience*—had they never been performed at all, this course of things ought to have been reversed. For the appeal to them would have been ruinous to His cause in the case of those who would have been sure to see them if they had been wrought; but who, on the infidel hypothesis, could not have seen them because they never had been wrought: whilst, on the other hand, subsequent generations might possibly have been induced to believe in Christ by false stories about Him which at that distance of time they could not disprove. But as the case stands, it is the *contemporaries* of Christ—those that knew most about Him—that are converted, while the Jews of the next and following generations, who knew least about Him, remain unconvinced. This circumstance is one of profound importance, turning, as it does, the

* Matt. xi. 4, 5. John ix. 3, 4; x. 32; xiv. 10, 11; xv. 24; xx. 30, 31.

subsequent unbelief of His nation into a most powerful argument for the truth of the facts which substantiated His mission.

And these considerations are very much strengthened by a comparison of Christianity with those other religions whose beginnings can be traced, and which may, therefore, be termed historical religions, and not mere mythologies—I mean Buddhism and Mohammedanism. The Buddha was engaged during more than forty years in preaching his religion. Mohammed was similarly engaged during a period not quite as long. Christ preached His religion *only for three years.* Nothing is more astonishing than the brevity of the time which yet sufficed to found the widest spread, the most influential, of all religions! Three years! Again, Buddhism was never persecuted: was, indeed, strongly supported by many Hindoo potentates: the Buddha died in peace in extreme old age of a surfeit of swine's flesh.* Mohammedanism never began to flourish till it grasped the sword: neither force nor favour were at the command of the Christian propaganda. Again, Buddhism is not really a religion; it is a philosophy, an *atheosophy*, which explains, in a way consistent with the ingrained pessimism of the Hindoo mind, our existence and our relations with the universe, and give rules of life accordingly. It is not—it does not profess to be—a revelation; it is simply a supposed ethical or philosophical discovery, the product of meditation, which any one accepting pessimistic principles could make for himself; and being such, it rests on no basis of alleged facts, as Christianity does, and thus eludes that appeal to evidence which is absolutely vital or absolutely fatal to Christianity.† Mohammedanism, too, escapes the difficult, the desperate, appeal to evidence; for the only evidence of the truth of his mission Mohammed ever offered was the sublimity of the style of the Koran. It gained its converts by the grandeur of its simplicity, by its proclamation of the absolute unity of God: still more, by its proclamation of the absolute equality of all its converts—of the absolute superiority of its converts over the infidel, no matter how high his rank, thus constituting all Mussulmen into an aristocracy of peers, lording it over mankind by the sword. Thus it exactly coincided with the instincts of the warlike nomads of Arabia, and by the aid of kindred instincts in other savage tribes, it still conquers and still enslaves. To compare such systems with Christianity, by way of illustrating the conquests of the latter, is an outrage upon history. Unlike both Buddhism and Mohammedanism, Christianity ran counter to the current of both the civilizations it first addressed. To the Jews the Cross was an offence; to the Greeks, to the whole of the then civilized world, it was folly. How then was this strange religion "floated"?—to use the slang of the Stock Exchange. How did the vessel ever get out of port? This is the question which the opponents of Christianity have to answer, and which they never yet have answered satisfactorily.

On the other hand, if the actions ascribed to Christ were actually done; if He really did go about Palestine "doing good," physically benefiting multitudes by the exercise of superhuman power; if He *did* rise from the dead; if He *did* send down on His tried disciples a marvellous power of spiritually influencing the minds of men; if their hopeless sorrow for His death was really "turned" suddenly "into joy"—a joy so great and so pervasive as to impress all that saw them with the irresistible conviction of the truth of what they declared they had beheld, and which had caused it—why, *then*, indeed, the rapid diffusion, the astonishing success, of the religion they proclaimed is perfectly natural, quite to be expected. For strong conviction will make its way. The phenomenon of its success, inexplicable on the supposition that Christianity is false, is perfectly plain and adequately accounted for if it be true. I lay especial stress on this, because I think it is in itself enough to prove the truth of our religion. Its principles are so strange; so unwelcome to the natural heart; the wishes of that heart are either so contradicted, or so *perversely* gratified by Christianity—gratified in such an ungratifying way; the circumstances of the time were so adverse to its success, that the longer I reflect, the more do I feel that the incipient difficulty of inducing belief at all, unless what claimed belief were true, and widely known to be true, is insurmountable. Had Christianity not been true, it would never have been launched at all into a world which did not want it, which did not like it, and which, when forced to accept it, directly set about spoiling it as the next best thing to rejecting it altogether. For what are those corruptions of Christianity over which unbelievers like Gibbon gloat with so much relish—what are they but so many proofs how disagreeable to the human heart is Christianity in its first purity, and therefore, how difficult it must have been to induce men to accept it at first, when it was most pure?

And here comes in what we may well call the *mechanism* of its earliest diffusion. On this the book of "The Teaching" has thrown a vivid light.*

* See "Buddhism," by Sir M. Monier Williams, p. 49.

† See Monier Williams, p. 38, and *passim.*

* "The Teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles through the Twelve Apostles" (διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), is the full title of a little book discovered about fifteen years ago in the Library of the Jerusalem Patriarchate at Constantinople by Philotheus Byrennius, then Metropolitan of Serrae, now of Nicomedia. It was published for the first time at Constantinople in 1882, by the same most learned man, with copious critical apparatus and notes.

It is mentioned by several of the Fathers, notably by Eusebius of Cæsarea, by Athanasius, and, some centuries after him, by Nicephorus of Constantinople, whose notice identifies the book, inasmuch as he specifies the number of lines in the manuscript of it.

It falls into two main divisions: the first is a descrip-

According to that book, there were in the earliest Church four orders of ministers, just as we find four such orders mentioned in the Epistle to the Ephesians,* with which the book of "The Teaching" is probably contemporaneous. These orders were —Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, and Bishops and Deacons. Now, if we examine the statement of St. Peter, at the first convention of the Church, we find that the chief qualifications for taking the place of an Apostle in the Sacred College of the Twelve was the having companied with Jesus throughout His earthly ministry, and the having seen Him alive after death in His Resurrection-body.† Just as St. Paul seems to rank the having

tion of the "Two Ways," the way of life, and the way of death; these are altogether confined to morality; there is nothing of what would now be called Christian doctrine in this part of the treatise. The second part begins with a description of baptism, how it is to be administered; then come injunctions about fasting, and a text of the Lord's Prayer, almost identical with that in St. Matthew, and an injunction to use it thrice a day; then a description of the Eucharist, the order for celebrating it, beginning (which is remarkable) with the cup, accompanied with very brief prayers. Then come directions how the apostles and prophets are to be treated "according to the doctrine *δόγμα* of the Gospel." "Let every apostle coming to you be received as the Lord: but he shall not remain one day: in case of necessity, he may remain a second day; but if he remain three days, he is a false prophet. And when the apostle goes forth, let him receive nothing except some bread (sufficient to carry him on to the place where he puts up at night); if he ask for money, he is a false prophet." Then considerations concerning prophets; how they are not to be tempted (cross-questioned) nor criticised, for this is the irremissible sin. Not everyone, however, speaking in spirit is a prophet, but only he who has the ways of the Lord (who imitates Christ in his walk and conversation.) By this the false prophet and the true are to be recognised. The prophet who says, speaking apparently, in the Spirit, Give me money or something else, is not to be listened to; but if he exhorts to give in the case of others who are in want, he is not to be condemned by any one. Every true prophet, wishing to take up his residence with a Church, is worthy of his maintenance. So also is every true teacher. If you have no teacher or prophet to give to, give it to the poor.... Then come directions for the election of bishops and deacons "worthy of the Lord."

These particulars are not only of extreme interest in themselves, but they appear to me to show that the book is of much higher antiquity than Bryennius supposes. He places it somewhere between A.D. 120 and A.D. 160. I will now give my reasons for assigning it to a time not long, if at all, posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem.

2. The terms "apostles and prophets," which are employed of distinct and different sets of persons, could not be used of any person except, in the case of apostles, such as had actually seen the Lord (see 1 Cor. ix. 1), in the case of prophets, of such as had received the gift of prophecy by the laying on of the hands of the Twelve. There was an attempt to revive the gift of prophecy in the second century by Montanus and his followers; or rather, a pretence that it had been revived by them; but there is no trace in "The Teaching" of any warning against the fanaticism that engendered these pretences. The warning is simply against those who, possessing actual spiritual gifts, abused them for selfish purposes. So, too, the difference between apostles and bishops, which subsequent times often endeavoured to obliterate, by calling bishops successors of the apostles, or even giving them the name of apostles: this difference appears in all its fulness in "The Teaching;" the apostles being simply wandering preachers, going incessantly from place to place, and not supported by the Church; while the bishops are to be elected by the Church as its resident overseers.

3. The fourfold ministry of "The Teaching" seems exactly the same as that described in Ephesians iv. 11—"He gave some to be apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." In "The Teaching" we have apostles, prophets, teachers (chap. xiii.), bishops and deacons. Now, this organisation could not exist except in the very earliest times; and the coincidence of the two statements, that of the Ephesians and that of "The Teaching," seems to prove that they are nearly contemporaneous.

4. A third reason for a very high antiquity is the extreme simplicity of the ritual prescribed both for baptism and the Eucharist in "The Teaching." Particularly does one expression indicate this. In the tenth chapter the completion of the Eucharist is indicated by the words *μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι*, "after your being satiated or filled," an expression softened by the long subsequent Apostolic Constitution, into *μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάλημψιν*, "after reception." Clearly the expression in "The Teaching" goes back to the time when the Lord's Supper was still administered as it was at Corinth in the time of St. Paul, in such a way that it was possible to eat and drink copiously, or even immoderately, at it. Such a word as "filled, sated," *ἐμπλησθῆναι*, would never be used of those who received only a morsel of bread and a few drops of wine. But we know that this earliest method of reception must have been soon abandoned, on account of the dangers of irreverence and excess connected with it: hence the expression in "The Teaching" indicates some period still within the limits of apostolic administration.

5. The circumstance that only bishops and deacons are mentioned in "The Teaching," as in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, takes us back to the time preceding the separation of the episcopate from the presbyterate, *i.e.*, to the time preceding the death of the Apostle John.

Taking all these things together, I feel that I can with safety appeal to "The Teaching" as indicating the extent to which the vagrant preaching of those who had "seen the Lord," and were therefore apostles, in the sense of the word as used by St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 1), was organised and accepted in the very earliest Church. And the very defectiveness, in a doctrinal point of view, of "The Teaching" points to an extremely ancient period, antecedent to the time when Christian doctrine (teaching) became Christian theology in the hands of the great Apostles, Paul and John.

I have forgotten to call attention to one remarkable difference between the different classes of ministers mentioned in "The Teaching." The apostles and prophets, as also the teachers, are simply accepted or rejected by the churches according as their doctrine and their life agree with the teaching and life of Christ. They do not derive their authority from the people whom they address. But the bishops and deacons are elected by the Church,

This distinction is perfectly natural, if the first three classes, apostles, prophets, teachers, were sent out directly by Christ Himself or by the Twelve who wielded Christ's authority after He was taken up. But it is not natural nor indeed intelligible, if the first three classes had been elected by the churches, as the bishops and deacons were.

Though "The Teaching" cannot be regarded as having enjoyed actual authority as a manual of instruction and of practice, it must have expressed the mind of the early Church to a great extent, to judge from the respect with which it is treated by Eusebius and Athanasius; the latter recommending it to catechumens, and classing it with the Shepherd of Hermas, which we know was often read in churches. Now, this respect it could not have enjoyed, had it depicted a state of things which never existed.

* Ephesians iv. 11.

† Acts i. 21, 22. Compare Acts iii. 15, and x. 40, 41.

seen the Lord as an indispensable qualification for an Apostle. "Am not I an Apostle? Have I not seen the Lord"?* The first of these qualifications, the having companied with Christ during three years of His earthly ministry, would be of extreme importance to those who, like the Twelve, were to bear witness to their Master's teaching, to hand it on, and to work it into the mind of His disciples when He should have left them. But the second qualification—the having beheld Him alive after His Resurrection—must have fallen to the lot of many believers who had, nevertheless, not attended on Him throughout His whole ministry. No doubt numbers were favoured with the sight of their risen Lord, who had not accompanied Him during the whole of the memorable triennium. We are told by St. Paul, that on one occasion he showed Himself to above five hundred brethren at once, most of whom, he adds, still survive,† a remark which proves that their names were well known, and probably recorded in the books of the Church. Now every one of these would be a witness to the fact of His Resurrection. What these five hundred had seen, we cannot for a moment suppose they would not be eager to make known to others. To what purpose else had their Master displayed Himself alive to them? Was it in order that they might put their candle under a bushel, and not on the candlestick, were it might give light to them that were sitting in darkness and the shadow of death? Why were they made witnesses *of* His Resurrection, except that they might bear witness *to* His Resurrection? Accordingly, in the book of "The Teaching," we find a class of apostles described entirely distinct from the Sacred College of the Twelve. The whole function of these second-class apostles is to go about from place to place, proclaiming the great facts of Christianity, especially, of course, the Resurrection of its Founder. Except under the pressure of the extremest necessity, they are never to spend more than a single day in any one place; if they stayed three days, they were to be deemed false prophets, and deprived of their ministry.

* 2 Cor. ix. 1.

† 1 Cor. xv. 6.

The occasion on which our Lord appeared after His Resurrection to above five hundred brethren at once is not distinctly specified. But we may be sure it was in Galilee, since only in Galilee could such a number of disciples be collected (in Jerusalem there were only one hundred and twenty: Acts i. 15); and if it was in Galilee, it was most probably that described in the last verses of St. Matthew, although only the eleven Apostles are actually mentioned. For there would be no reason to send the eleven into Galilee, if they were to be the only persons to whom He was to appear there. But Galilee was full of His disciples; insomuch that "a Galilaean" had already become almost synonymous with a disciple of Christ (Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70: Luke xxii. 59). And the circumstance that Jesus "had appointed them" a certain mountain (Matt. xxviii. 16), where they should see Him, hints at a large number being convened to a place where they might be secure from intrusion, and where His appearance would be the more conspicuous.

This singular arrangement, while it reflects light on the Epistle to the Ephesians, explains the otherwise incomprehensibly rapid diffusion of Christianity throughout the Eastern portion of the Roman Empire. For just reflect for a moment on the necessary effect of such a rapid and pervasive propaganda! Imagine these numerous witnesses of Christ's Resurrection, each starting on his great mission, proclaiming in every market-town, in every place of Jewish worship, in the precincts, very possibly—of many an idol-temple, "I have seen, I have myself seen, the dead restored to life! I have seen Jesus declared to be the Son of God with power by His Resurrection! I have beheld Him, I have approached Him, I have clung to Him by His pierced feet, I have worshipped Him, I have heard Him utter the mighty words, 'All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth, go ye therefore and make all nations my disciples!' And it is in obedience to that omnipotent command that I am here addressing you!" Is it any wonder that such a message, delivered with all the fervour of the most absolute conviction by persons who derived no profit whatever from it, who refused to stay a moment longer than might be necessary to recruit their fatigue, and who seemed to have no other enjoyment, as they had no other occupation, than to spread the glad tidings as widely as possible,—is it any wonder if such a message, so delivered, should have made thousands on thousands of converts throughout those parts of the empire where this propaganda worked? And this is no fancy picture. In its essence it is the very task which Christ Himself had set to His disciples. They were not merely to *accept* the Gospel. They were to *proclaim* the Gospel. They were not merely to acknowledge Christ themselves, they were to bring others to acknowledge Him. For *this* it was requisite that they should abandon all other pursuits, and give themselves wholly to Christ. Hence the absolute sacrifice of all their worldly goods Christ demanded of all who should follow Him. It was not that the possession of property was wrong in itself. Christ was no socialist. It was simply that the possession of property was not compatible with the great task which, by volunteering to become His disciples, they had undertaken: the task of accompanying Him during His earthly life, of proclaiming Him in His immortal existence after His withdrawal from this earth. And can we imagine that those who had abandoned all worldly interests for His sake would revert to them, would resume their worldly occupations as soon as their Lord's Resurrection had proved to them that He had claimed no more than He had a right to claim when He had required of them the abandonment of all worldly ties for His sake? And if they did not return to those secular pursuits, what else were they to do? what resource was left to them, unless to go about, bearing their simple but most power-

ful witness to His Resurrection? Can we wonder that such a ministry, such an organization, *floated* Christianity, and made it an instantaneous power in the Roman world? Nay, would anything short of such an organisation have sufficed to effect a change so vast in so short a time?*

The considerations through which I have conducted you are at once the explanation of Christianity and the justification of Christianity. They explain Christianity as being not a system of dogma, not a theology, but a belief in a Person, the Divine Man, the second head of the human race, the introducer of a Divine and never-ending life into into that race. They justify Christianity, because they show how entirely natural was its immense success if it were true, how entirely unnatural, or rather how impossible, would have been its success, had it been false. If the facts proclaimed by its first missionaries were true, if they had actually taken place, then the restless activity of those missionaries was quite to be expected; they could not help going about declaring to others the wonderful things of which they had been the eye-witnesses, and of which their resignation of all their secular employments had unfitted them for being aught else than the preachers. Had Christianity in its great facts been false; had Christ, like John the Baptist, done no miracles; had He gone down to the rock-hewn tomb a mere common corpse, never reanimated with the breath of life, never re-appearing to cheer and inspire His followers, stolen, perhaps, out of the sepulchre by their affection, but incapable of being galvanised into life by the pious theft, a useless, a discouraging, a dangerous burden; had there been nothing to proclaim but a brief career of philanthropic vagabondage, cut short by a shameful death, leading no whither, and having no ulterior meaning;—who can imagine that men, who must in that case have felt that they had been cheated out of their livelihood by the rash and unfounded pretensions of this dead enthusiast, would have gone about eagerly proclaiming what they must have known to be a miserable delusion, calling on men to accept a Saviour who could not save Himself; a leader who had led no whither; a teacher whose claims had been scouted by those who had the best right to examine and adjudicate upon them? The adversaries of Christianity appear to me to have no historic sense; they cannot see the facts of the case; at any rate, they do not grapple with those facts, but cheat themselves and their followers with vague and impotent generalities. The attractions of sympathy and fellowship, the delights of a brotherly union of congenial souls, such things as these will not enable men to endure horrible tortures and death itself. Nor will they induce the offspring of a sceptical age, an age of exhausted reason and exhausted passion, like the first century of our era, to grasp at an idle tale, as the impugners of historic Christianity must maintain the Gospel history to be, and to persevere in believing it in spite of a universal social ban. Great effects demand adequate causes, as I said before; the attempts to trace back the enormous success of Christianity to causes so frivolous, so weak, so utterly inadequate, as those assigned by modern sceptics, only require being looked at to be at once found wanting. Nothing but the immense missionary activity of the earliest Church could have *floated* Christianity, and nothing but the most intense conviction of the great facts of Christianity, especially of the Resurrection of Christ, could have produced that immense activity.

The cause for which I plead to-day is in direct and obvious connection with the argument I have endeavoured to put before you. As the missionary activity of the earliest Church was the truest test of that Church's vigorous life, as well as the cause of its rapid expansion, so the state of any portion of the Church now may be accurately gauged by the amount of its missionary effort. What is the cause of the fatal lethargy of German Protestantism? It is that activity has given way to speculation. Men theorize in Germany instead of acting. What is the cause of the utter deadness of the Romish Church in Italy and Spain? It is the utter absence of all missionary effort. No Gospel goes forth from those countries into the dark places of the earth. Our own Church is but now re-awakening to some consciousness of her duties in this regard. The great missionaries to whom it owed its foundation, and who extended Irish Christianity over Scotland and over Western Europe, Patrick, Columba, Columbanus, left no successors. Missions died out of the mediæval Irish Church, as they did out of the Church of England. *Now* there is a revival of missionary work on a large scale in England, on a small scale here. The sneers and scoffs of the wise of this world, loud and effective at the beginning of this century, have died out; the Gospel of Christ is again felt to be the power of God and the wisdom of God. Of the two agencies of Anglican Missions, the Society for which I plead to-day is the most ancient, and the most entirely expressive of the mind of the Church. But the other and younger Society is vigorous and effective too; and the mission-field requires them both. Let your contributions this day, and your consistent support in future, show that you understand the obligations of the Church, and the tenure of her continuance. Only as long as she fulfils her Lord's last command, by going and making disciples of all nations, will she be able to rely on His last promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

* See previous Note.

THE Queen has sent £50 as a donation towards the restoration of Green's Norton Church, near Towcester.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1890.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SESSION.

THERE is one feature in British politics which everyone will see perpetually recurs, and that is the sudden precipitation of a crisis without any, or with but little, preparatory warning. No matter what party is in power the same kind of thing happens. Ministers do not altogether meet the views of their own supporters; there are mutual explanations, magnified of course into grave divergencies of opinion, and then come rumours of disunion, and wilder allegations still of a possible dissolution.

All these phases of public disquietude undoubtedly showed themselves the week before last. They ran their course, and after a fitful and feverish existence they have disappeared. When it became evident at the meeting of the Conservative party at the Carlton Club that there were decidedly strong *primâ facie* objections to the proposal of the Cabinet to suspend Bills from one session to another, there was sufficient reason for a certain amount of disquietude on the part of Unionists, and of joy on the part of the Opposition. The remarkable point in the whole affair is, however, that it is altogether a dispute between party men themselves. The country has been and is quite satisfied with the work of the Government, and with its general policy, and was certainly unprepared for the news that the Conservative party was at variance with itself upon a point of procedure.

What is the question at issue? Not so many weeks ago the whole question of the Parliamentary Session was discussed, and various opinions were put forward as to the feasibility of so arranging the time of sitting that public business might be advanced, and the life of Parliamentarians, somewhat relieved from the burdens which press more and more heavily with the advance of our democratic system. The continued obstruction of the Opposition to the principal measures of the Government at length brought the question to the front, somewhat suddenly no doubt, and naturally there was a considerable amount of conflicting opinion upon it. Lord Salisbury proposed such a change of Parliamentary procedure as would allow the House to rise on August 1st. Any Bill which, having arrived at the Committee stage, had not been passed at that date, would be postponed by a special resolution of the House, re-introduced next session, and the remaining stages gone through.

For over twenty years Lord Salisbury himself has been in favour of this reform, so that he cannot be said to be proposing it for the mere purpose of forcing specific measures into law. He believes, and so do a large majority of the best minds in the country, that the present system is irrational. The present rule requires that every Bill introduced in a session must either be passed into law, or thrown aside for recommencement at the beginning of next session.

A large section of the Conservative party at first felt inclined to resist the proposal, and a vigorous expression of opinion was given that an Autumn Session was far preferable to the practice of suspending Bills. Gradually, however, the innate antagonism of the older Conservative minds to the idea was dispelled by a clearer appreciation of the situation. Parliament would be more or less emancipated from the worst forms of obstruction; useful Bills could be prosecuted and turned out not altogether unrecognisable by their promoters; adequate time for the discussion of measures would be assured, and thus their usefulness would be something in proportion to the demand for them. The House of Lords is at present well-nigh paralysed in its work as an estate of the realm, and the House of Commons is admittedly deteriorating in many important respects. To restore to the Council of the nation control over its own time and to relieve the strain upon Ministers and Members would be no mean achievement to point to, and the proposals of the Cabinet in this direction deserve, and will get, the sympathy and support of the great majority of patriotic Englishmen.

SCHINOS.—A friend writes as follows:—"I have lately been hearing a good deal about a pick-me-up called Schinos, which from all accounts is an Eastern preparation, the use of which can be traced back some 1,500 years. It is very pleasant in flavour, and some medical brethren state that its effect in severe cases of exhaustion, where life even has been despaired of, the benefit derived from Schinos has been simply marvellous; it is very pleasant to take, and administered as sherry and bitters would be just before dinner, with a little water. Schinos is specially useful for members of the literary profession who suffer from great mental and bodily fatigue. After a day's labour many have felt inclined to give up an evening's enjoyment from sheer exhaustion, but after taking a liqueur glassful of Schinos with a little water, have felt fully able to submit to the pleasures of a long evening with their friends."

LUX MUNDI.

By the Rev. Prebendary TILNEY BASSETT, M.A., Vicar of Dulverton.

A Paper read before the Dunster Clerical Association on June 10th, 1890.

(*Continued from page* 299.)

I have ventured to impose this dry and scanty sketch of the whole question in order that we may be able to enter into the painful inquiry as to how far Mr. Gore has implicated himself with these opinions. Many have swallowed the whole system with appetite and relish, as Cheyne and Robinson Smith; others have partly accepted the conclusions; some are stumbled, and (thank God) many resist the whole as a Socinian confederacy against sound doctrine. To which party does the essayist belong? You will call to mind the theories as to the composition of the Pentateuch. Mr. Gore (pp. 351, 352) puts forth such sentences as these: "There is a profound air of historical truthfulness pervading the Old Testament record from Abraham downward." "But does the inspiration of the recorder guarantee the exact historical truth of what he records?" "And in matters of fact, can the record with due regard to legitimate historical criticism be pronounced true?" In reply, he continues, "Of course the battle of historical truth cannot be fought on the field of the Old Testament as it can on that of the New, because it is so vast and indecisive," &c. Again, "There is still room for an admixture of what is not strictly historical—the attribution to first founders of what is really the remoter result of their institutions." "Now historical criticism assures us that this process has been largely at work in the Pentateuch." "By an analysis, the force of which is very great, it distinguishes distinct stages in the growth of the law of worship, at least an early stage—in the Book of the Covenant, a second stage in Deuteronomy, a last stage in the priestly code." Further on, "Their inspiration did not consist in a miraculous communication to them of facts as they originally happened;" "but if we believe that the law, as it grew, really did represent the Divine intention for the Jews, gradually worked out upon a basis of a Mosaic institution, there is nothing materially untruthful, though there is something uncritical, in attributing the whole legislation to Moses under divine command." "It would be only on a piece with the attribution of the collection of Psalms to David and of Proverbs to Solomon." Which *pace* Mr. Gore is not done without a full explanation. Passing over his advocacy of idealising, by which he means transferring after thoughts and knowledge to a previous period, he cites the Book of Wisdom, as professing to be written by Solomon, which was not the fact. He argues: "We may conceive the same to be true of Ecclesiastes and of Deuteronomy, *i.e.*, we may suppose Deuteronomy to be a republication of the law in the spirit and power of Moses put dramatically in his mouth." "Criticism goes further, and asks us to regard Jonah and Daniel as dramatic compositions worked up on a basis of history." In page 356 Mr. Gore writes of the "Myth": "Has the Jewish history such an earlier stage? Does it pass back out of history into myth? In particular, are not its earlier narratives before the call of Abraham of the nature of myth, in which we cannot distinguish the historical germ, though we do not at all deny that it exists?"

Again (p. 358), he raises the question whether our Lord's use of the Old Testament militates against such concessions, and he coolly argues that Jonah's history may be fact or allegory. The idea conveyed in that narrative is enough for the purpose of suggesting our Lord's discourse. He treats the history of the Flood in like manner, and urges that the additions interpolated by the Lord favour his theory. But the crowning piece of criticism is found in connection with our Lord's argument founded on Psalm cx. The Lord argues, he says, with the Pharisees on the assumption of the Davidic authorship, but the point of his argument is directed to convincing the Pharisees that they did not understand their own teaching. "It is surely pressing His words unduly to represent them as positive teaching on a literary point. To argue *ad hominem* was, in fact, a part of our Lord's method. If Christ had intended to convey instruction to us on critical questions which are within the scope of natural knowledge He would have made His purpose plainer." "The Incarnation was a self-emptying of God to reveal Himself under conditions of human nature and from a human point of view." "He *used* human nature, its relation to God, its conditions of experience, its growth in knowledge, its limitation of knowledge." He speaks of the sun rising, &c. He shows no sign of transcending the science of His age; equally He shows no signs of transcending the history of His age."

Mr. Gore seems to close his eyes to the fact that the whole force of our Lord's argument is based upon David being the author of the words of this psalm. David calls the Messiah his Lord and Master. How then can the Messiah be simply his son, for what son is his father's master or lord? Mr. Gore is silent about the reasons for which he is so desirous of depriving David of the honour of writing this psalm. He should have said that modern criticism began with allotting several psalms and then the last three books of the psalter to the times of the Maccabees, and has now at length made the critical discovery that *all* the psalms are of that date. This psalm, therefore, must have been the composition of some unknown poet in honour of Simon or Judas Maccabæus.

Much is urged by Mr. Gore and his school on our Lord's increase, or rather advance, in *knowledge*, but St. Luke says in *wisdom*—σοφία, and not knowledge, γνῶσις. Now there are three words of constant use in Scripture—σοφία, σύνεσις, and γνῶσις; σοφία, or wisdom, is the attribute or faculty of discerning right; σύνεσις, commonly rendered "understanding," is the using of the former faculty, *comprehension*, grasping the subject, and the result is the third, γνῶσις, *knowledge*. Further, the purpose of the Incarnation was to REVEAL the Father to mankind. All, therefore, that our Lord taught concerning God and the Scriptures was intended to be revelation, a disclosing to us of the mysteries which needed unveiling. The text in St. Luke ii. 52 can only mean that Jesus advanced in mental and bodily development, and there is no reference to the question of limitation or non-limitation in the words. The text has nothing to do with the subject under discussion.

It would carry us to too great a length, and this paper is too long already, were we to attempt a refutation of the theories started and accepted by the rationalistic writers on the Continent and in our own

country. Linguistic peculiarities in these ancient books are too technical for introduction here, and they are in this instance, as in all others, like a two-edged sword, and equally destructive of either side of the question, according to the ingenuity of the disputant, who will either see or fail to see, as the case may be, that words may be in use which did not find a place, or rarely so, in the small legacy of literature that has been left us; or that changes may take place in the vocabulary of an individual after many years and a chequered experience, and when treating of different subjects, and that, too, before grammatical laws were laid down, and language was more the utterance of emotions than a vehicle for argumentation and dialectics. But for the purpose of clearing the way of these obstacles, it may be well to throw out a few hints in connection with them.

As to the formation of the Pentateuch: It can scarcely be doubted that archives of the remotest ages were preserved by some kind of notation, of which the hieroglyphic characters of ancient Egyptian may preserve to us the earliest form; and that Moses collected such relics of antiquity, arranged and edited them. Various sources of supply might furnish information characterised by different names of the Divine Being, or Moses might arrange them, as they certainly are arranged, with the intention of marking the material creation, the acts of judgment, and so forth, by the name of Elohim and the spiritual sections we the name of Jehovah. The parallelistic character also of Hebrew composition, not only in sentences and verses, but als oin paragraphs, has not been sufficiently noted by these critics.

Turning to Isaiah, to whose writings reference has been made. It is to be remarked that all the books of the Prophets are headed with the name of the author, often accompanied by the name of his father, his country, or the contemporaneous kings. This is an unbroken rule, even in case of the shortest writings. How then could 27 chapters, one of the longest of prophetic productions, one that is distinguished for its excellence of language and style, one that contains so much important matter, how could such a composition be launched out upon the world without a signature, tacked on to another's name, or hiding itself under an anonym? Such an exception to literary laws and to a general rule must be accounted for, which is not done by these objectors to the traditional authorship of Isaiah.

Much difficulty has been found in dealing with the Psalter. The description of one who should suffer and yet triumph is so evident, and the correspondence between the picture drawn and the Lord Jesus when He came so unmistakeable, that a denial of identity seems impossible; but these teachers are not stumbled by trifles; they say prophecy was not prediction, but Israel formed *an ideal* in their minds what sort of a man a perfect one should be, and this ideal was most exactly manifested and concreted in the person and character of Jesus of Nazareth. But surely if this were so, why did Israel reject their ideal? The later the date fixed for the composition of the Psalter the greater is the inconsistency of this theory, for so far from accepting the ideal of their grandfathers, the grandchildren, as represented by all classes and conditions of men, the chief priests, Scribes and Rabbis, and the motley multitude, united in one savage chorus, crying out with throats of iron, "Crucify Him." How could the ideal be thus entertained by one generation and dispatched by so closely a succeeding one?

"Ecclesiastes may be a drama." "There are words in use that could not have been in common use in Jerusalem in the time of Solomon," say the critics; but we would reply, it was not written by the people of Jerusalem, nor does it profess to be. Neither does it categorically claim the name of Solomon. That he was the author rests on inferences drawn from the book itself and on tradition. But with reference to the main difficulty, the linguistic argument, are we not told that Solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines out of the nations of the East? And if such a medley did not vitiate his diction, I fail to know what would do so. "Daniel too may be a drama" (p. 355, 356). The critics urge that it must be posterior to the awful scenes it describes." Why? Because, the critics say, prediction is a simple impossibility. Antiochus Epiphanes died in 164 B.C., therefore, this book, which contains his evil doings, could not have been written before 163 B.C. But does this denial really disprove prediction? Did not Daniel foretell the advent of the Messiah? Did he not tell of the destruction of the city? Did he not foretell the future fortunes of the great kingdoms of the world, and are not all these fulfilled or fulfilling?

"The Psalms," according to the "last results," "are Maccabean." But we are told, more than two centuries before, that Hebrew had ceased to be the language "understanded of the people," yet the Psalms are in the best Hebrew, and some are in archaic style. What good would they be in temple and synagogue service? It would be like compiling a hymn book for our Church at the present period, and admitting into the collection only those that were written in imitation of the style and terminology of Chaucer.

All these assaults upon God's word are only conjectural opinions. Certain critics put forth their theories as if they were discoveries, their name for learning throws a glamour round them, and men fear that they shall lose their own reputation for scholarship unless they accept their conclusions, or, at all events, come to a compromise with them. Let criticism, real and true, be exercised by all means; let discoveries be sought for and found. Truth has nothing to fear; but do not let us be carried away with every wind of heretical pravity because it is novel, because it is ingenious, because it is German, because it is the "last results." Such is not learning nor legitimate inquiry. The real truth is, that *Lux Mundi* is based upon the theory of evolution, and therefore the argument when pressed home, simply means that religion comes *ab intra*, from man's own mind and design, and so grows with his growth in civilisation and mental improvement; whereas the orthodox hold that religion is a revelation *ab extra*, and comes to us from without, in a word, from God Himself.

Mr. Gore has put out a quasi apology to the effect that certain "alterations are intended to emphasise what the author meant to express, and to preclude the the supposition that our Lord either (1) used, knowingly, an erroneous premiss to bring the Pharisees to a right conclusion; or (2) surrendered His human nature to fallibility. Whatever limitations of knowledge our Lord submitted Himself to in His incarnation, were deliberate self-limitations taken upon Himself in pursuance of His purpose of love." Such a retractation may soften down somewhat the rough edge of the preceding statements, but it is to be feared (1) that it throws the essay itself into confusion and makes it

self-contradictory, and (2) if accepted, the explanation does not go far enough to satisfy the orthodox conscience and judgment.

We have parties and schisms enough in the Church and outside her pale, and it is a matter of great and grave regret that one who holds the position of the Head of the Pusey House, whatever disclaimers he has made or may make in his forthcoming Bampton Lectures, should have put forth such an essay that no partial recalling or fragmentary alteration can remedy. This can only be effected by a manly cancelling of one third of his essay, and his public renunciation of heresy into which he seems to have been betrayed.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE (SO-CALLED) MEDICAL LANGUAGE IN THE THIRD GOSPEL.

[The small capitals and italics in the quotations in this letter are, generally, *not* in the author quoted.]

SIR,—I pointed out in my last letter that Dr. Hobart *assumes* the fundamental proposition which he ought to prove, namely, the use of a definite technical medical language in the Apostolic Age. Throughout Dr. Hobart's book we find such remarks as these: "Peculiar to St. Luke, a technical medical term;" "peculiar to St. Luke, much employed in medical language;" "peculiar to St. Luke; it was the technical term for the rest or fulcrum of the lever in surgical operations," etc. (pp. 194, 195, 259). When this is repeated, page after page, for the whole 300 pages, it is no wonder that even scholars are impressed, especially if they do not make a careful examination into the whole matter. Dr. Hobart (p. xxx.) adds that "Greek medical language was particularly conservative in its character, the same class of words being employed in it from the time of Hippocrates to that of Galen," that is, during a period of 600 years, a longer interval than that separating Canon Liddon from John Wyclif. Surely we must demand some proof of so sweeping a statement. In his preface Dr. Hobart tells us that "the extant Greek medical writers, from whom the examples of the medical use of such words are taken, are Hippocrates, B.C. 460—357; Aretæus who lived in the first century after Christ, probably in the reign of Nero or Vespasian; Galen, A.D. 130—200; and Dioscorides, who lived in the first or second century of the Christian era."

Before going further, let me quote what Dr. Whewell says: "The successors of Hippocrates became a medical school of great note in its day, designated as the *Dogmatic* School, in OPPOSITION to which arose an *Empiric* sect, who professed to deduce their modes of cure, not from theoretical dogmas, but experience. These RIVAL PARTIES prevailed principally in Asia Minor and Egypt, during the time of Alexander's successors" (Hist. of Inductive Sciences, iii. p. 320). Dr. Hobart (p. xxxi.) points out: "It is remarkable that with the exception of Hippocrates, all the extant Greek medical writers were Asiatic Greeks . . . and Hippocrates, though not an Asiatic Greek, yet was born and lived in close proximity to the coast of Asia Minor, being a native of Cos. Hence it is natural that a similarity of diction should occur in writers who were trained in the medical schools of Asia Minor." Surely not, seeing that the "*rival* medical parties, the Dogmatics and the Empirics prevailed principally in Asia Minor," etc. To return to Dr. Whewell's account: "The victories of Lucullus and Pompeius, in Greece and Asia, made the Romans acquainted with the Greek philosophy, and the consequence was that shoals of philosophers, rhetoricians, poets, and physicians streamed from Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt to Rome and Italy, to traffic their knowledge and their arts for Roman wealth. Amongst these was one, whose name makes a great figure in the history of medicine, Asclepiades of Brusa, in Bithynia.

This man appears to have been a quack with the usual endowments of his class—boldness, singularity, a contemptuous rejection of all previously esteemed opinions, a new classification of diseases, a new list of medicines, and the assertion of some wonderful cures. He would not on such account deserve a place in the history of science, but that he became the FOUNDER OF A NEW SCHOOL the *Methodic* which professed to hold itself separate both from the *Dogmatics* and the *Empirics*. I have noticed these schools of medicine, because, though I am not able to state distinctly their respective merits in the cultivation of anatomy, a *great progress* in that science was undoubtedly made during their domination, of which the praise must, I conceive, be in some way divided among them. The amount of this progress we are able to estimate when we come to the works of Galen who flourished under the Antonines" (Hist. of Inductive Sciences, iii. p. 321.) Now let us hear what Galen himself says as to the unanimity of the medical sects who, according to Dr. Hobart, were all of "one lip" and one language: "Galen, the celebrated physician, speaks of the *great difficulty of* bringing about *any change* in the opinions of those who are devoted to *particular schools of medicine*, etc. (*De Diff. Puls.*, i. iii. *c.* 3.)." (Neander Church Hist., i. p. 239 n.). Will Dr. Hobart after this maintain that Greek medical language was "particularly conservative in its character," and that there was one definite technical medical language in use for 600 years from Hippocrates to Galen? At least Dr. Salmon and Dr. Plummer will not continue to aid and abet Dr. Hobart in maintaining and proclaiming what has been now clearly shown to be incorrect.

Something might be said too about the course of development of the Greek language, and the various dialects. Hippocrates wrote in Ionic, so did Aretæus; while Dioscorides and Galen employed the κοινὴ διάλεκτος which came into use after Alexander's conquests. The English language has certainly not been "particularly conservative in character" since the time of Chaucer. It is not, however, needful to linger over this. I pass on to supplement Dr. Hobart's account of the four medical writers. In doing so I reproduce to a great extent the words of others.

First we have Hippocrates, "the most celebrated physician of antiquity" (Whewell), "that great master of the art of physic" (Prideaux), who is acknowledged to have been the founder of medical science. Before his time the art of healing was a mixture of juggling and superstition. He taught the necessity of studying the symptoms of disease, and prescribed only the most simple remedies, declaring that the physician ought to follow Nature. He is said to have been the first to recognise the importance of diet. He practised surgery as well as medicine, but his knowledge of anatomy is thought to have been limited, and he "is held to have had no distinct conception of such an organ" as a *muscle*. His fame was so grea

that he was "called in" by Perdiccas, King of Macedon, whom he pronounced incurable; and he was also invited by Artaxerxes, with the promise of great rewards, to come into Persia during a great pestilence and cure those who were infected with it in his armies. But he replied that he would not leave the Greeks, his countrymen, also suffering from the same pestilence, to give his help to the barbarians. The Athenians conferred on him great honours, and voted a public maintenance for himself and his family. His memory is still venerated in his native island of Cos, where the inhabitants show the house which he occupied. A complete edition of his 72 essays has been published in Germany. In a word, we may say that Hippocrates is the Homer of the medical world.

For 500 years Hippocrates seems as a medical authority to have had it all his own way. At all events, he is the only medical writer quoted by Dr. Hobart during all these *five centuries* before the Christian Era. After such a start, who could be expected to catch him up, or indeed to compete with him at all? Not till the latter half of the first century A.D. do we come upon the next medical writer. "Aretæus, commonly called *the Cappadocian*, wrote certainly after Nero's reign began (A.D. 54), and probably flourished shortly before and after the decade (A.D. 60—70), in which St. Paul reached Rome and Jerusalem fell. There is much of strongly marked individuality in his work, more especially in the minute verbal portraiture of disease" (Dict. of Bible).

How does Dr. Hobart reconcile this last observation with his statement as to the "particularly conservative character of Greek medical language, the same class of words in it being employed from the time of Hippocrates to that of Galen?" And how does he reconcile with it *his own words* (p. 20), also with reference to Aretæus: "Now, this was a complete revolution in medical science since the time of Hippocrates." "Rival parties" "a complete revolution," "marked individuality in the verbal portraiture of disease"—all these, and yet a medical language "particularly conservative in its character," so that for centuries it remains as unchanging and unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians.

We now come to Dioscorides. "As the general science of medicine and surgery of this period may be represented by Aretæus, so we have nearly a representation of its *Materia Medica* by Dioscorides. He, too, was of the same general region—a Cicilian Greek—and his first lessons were probably learned at Tarsus. His period is tinged by the same uncertainty as that of Aretæus, but he has usually been assigned to the end of the first or the beginning of the second century" (Dict. of Bible). Dioscorides speaks of 600 plants, but often gives no description by which they can be identified. His work is held by the best judges to offer no evidence that he observed for himself, and this although he says expressly that his love of natural history and his military life have led him into many countries, in which he has had opportunity to become acquainted with the nature of herbs and trees. The main cause of his great reputation in subsequent times was, that he says much of the medicinal virtues of vegetables. The Dioscorides of the Middle Ages varied, however, materially from ours, the ancient writers being altogether perverted and disfigured (Whewell).

Last, but not least, in Dr. Hobart's list comes Galen. "He wrote commentaries both on Plato and on Hippocrates, the founder of Greek medical science.... Galen's distinctive aim was to place medical science on a psychological basis by studying the affections of the body in connection with those of the soul" (Jebb). Galen was born at Pergamos in A.D. 130. After obtaining a most liberal education he applied himself to the study of medicine, and *attended* ALL *the most eminent schools* in Greece and Egypt. Hence obviously there can be no reason why Galen should, as Dr. Hobart supposes (see above), confine himself to the "diction of the medical schools of Asia Minor."

After practising four years in his native city he went to Rome, but was driven thence by the *persecution of the physicians*, who attributed his success to magic. This again does not seem to support Dr. Hobart's notion of one hard and fast, cut and dried, technical medical language prevailing everywhere for hundreds of years. Galen now returned to Pergamos, but by the favour of the Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, he gained his footing at Rome. He died at the age of 70, in A.D. 200. He wrote 300 volumes (that is, as "F.T.P." has told us, *treatises*) on physic and also on many other sciences. The remains of his works were printed at Basle in 1538, and fill five folio volumes. Galen was second only in merit to Hippocrates, and to these two medical philosophers the moderns are indebted for many useful discoveries.

"The writings of Galen formed an epoch in medical science, and after his time *all the previous medical sects* seem to have become merged in his followers and imitators" (Smith, History of Greece, p. 602). What does Dr. Hobart say to this statement about "*all the medical sects*" before Galen's time? Did they all use this one technical medical language, the existence of which Dr. Hobart so quietly *assumes* throughout his argument?

Now, the first thing that strikes the critic, is that there are only *four* medical writers to appeal to, in the whole course of 600 years—*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*— not enough to allow the centuries even one medical writer apiece. Moreover for the first five centuries Hippocrates remains in sole possession, undisturbed master of the field, and monarch of all he surveys. Even Galen speaks of him with bated breath as "the great Hippocrates." Then secondly, a happy thought occurs to the critic that (as Galen was not born till A.D. 130—the very latest date fixed by sceptical critics like Zeller for the Acts), Galen must have borrowed from Luke, and not Luke from Galen—that is if there were any borrowing at all. The reputation of the famous Galen thus begins to pale before the fame of the unknown, or little known physician Luke!

The same criticism applies to Dioscorides, for the writer of the Acts being a companion of St. Paul (who did not survive the close of Nero's reign A.D. 68), it is quite clear that he could be in no way indebted to Dioscorides who flourished at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century." There is but one word peculiar to Luke and to Dioscorides in all Dr. Hobart's list, and that one word, ἀποσκευάζειν, occurs in the LXX. (Leviticus xiv. 36). Excepting Hippocrates, the only one of the four medical writers now remaining is Aretæus.

Now Aretæus "wrote certainly after Nero's reign began," that is, after A.D. 54. If the Acts were published, as Alford and many other eminent critics and commentators believe, in A.D. 63, we may be pretty sure that Luke's medical training and literary style could not have been appreciably influenced by the

writings of Aretæus. It is not likely that Luke had only just qualified as a physician when St. Paul first mentions him as "the beloved physician," in A.D. 62, in his Epistle to the Colossians (ch. iv. 11). And there is really not the slightest proof that the writings of Aretæus were in circulation before A.D. 60; the question and doubt is whether they were in circulation even so early as that date. There are only *three* so-called medical words peculiar to Luke and Aretæus (peculiar, that is, to Aretæus among the medical writers). Of these one is to be found in Josephus the Jew, another is in the Epistle of St. James, while the third, namely δοχή, occurs in the phrase καὶ ἐποιήσε δοχὴν μεγάλην (Luke v. 29; xiv. 13), which, as I have pointed out, corresponds word for word with the Septuagint account of Abraham, in Genesis xxi. 8. The critic therefore concludes that the *only* one of the four medical writers relied on by Dr. Hobart who could possibly have influenced Luke is Hippocrates.

Now, on scrutinising the 390 words in the body of Dr. Hobart's work, for which definite medical references are given, we find that 40 are peculiar (among the medical writers) to Galen, and may therefore be at once struck out as being not found in any medical writings till 100 years or so after Luke's time. Of the remaining 350 words, no less than 315 are used by the great Hippocrates. Well, says some hasty disputant, does not that conclusively prove that Luke, as a physician, was always poring over his pocket Hippocrates, and nourishing his enquiring mind with the wholesome mental diet to be found therein? No, I venture to reply, not at all; for 270 words out of the 315 were used (long before Luke) by the writers (or translators) of the Septuagint and of the Apocrypha (which was included in the Alexandrian Septuagint). The remaining 45 words (315—270), common to Hippocrates and the writer of the Third Gospel, are, as I stated in a previous letter, to be found (with the one exception of ἀνωτερικός) in the ordinary Greek authors.*

The works of Hippocrates had been circulating for nearly 500 years before they could possibly have fallen into the hands of Luke. They could not have failed to exercise considerable influence on the development of the Greek language, "Because Homer had written his poems in the old Ionic dialect, all succeeding Epic poets chose it for their compositions. In prose the Ionic dialect was used for a long time, because prose had first been composed in it; in this, too, Herodotus and Hippocrates wrote." "Herodotus and Hippocrates are the standards of Ionic." "The old Ionic dialect was originally very little or not at all different from the old Attic." (Matthiæ). "The 'common or universal dialect,' the literary language of the new Greece, coextensive with the Alexandrine empire, is substantially a form of Attic." (Simcox.) In fact just as Shakespeare and Milton have helped to mould and fix modern English, so Herodotus and Hippocrates influenced the Greek of succeeding ages.

About 300 years before Luke was born, the work of translating the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, resulting in the Septuagint, was commenced, and by that time the writings of Hippocrates having been current for a century or more, many of the words used by him had circulated far and wide; they had secured a firm footing, and had become part and parcel of ordinary Greek phraseology.

Thus, as I have said, 270 of the words in Dr. Hobart's list, which are used by Hippocrates, easily found their way into the Septuagint, whence many of them were obtained by the author of the Third Gospel. For once in the Septuagint (which was prized and read in all the Jewish communities and synagogues throughout the whole Greek-speaking—that is, the whole known—world) they became to him (as to every Jew) "familiar in his mouth as household words," and so he used them in his innocence without any thought of their medical origin or conection, untroubled by any ghastly suspicion that modern critics and learned universities would, because he so used them, turn him into a doctor.

H. HEBER EVANS.

June 4, 1890.

* For one of these, ἐπακροᾶσθαι, the only authority in Liddle and Scott is Plato, Comicus. The word also occurs in the Testaments of the XII. Patriarchs, early in the 2nd century, while ἐπακρόασις is used in the LXX.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alston, Rev. Frank Simpson, M.A., Vicar of Wispington, Horncastle.
Barnett, Rev. Henry, B.A., Rector of Quernmore, Lancaster.
Bren, Rev. Henry Alfred, M.A., Association Secretary C.M.S., West Yorks; Licensed to Preach in the Diocese of Ripon.
Burton, Rev. Richard Croyden, Curate of St. Mary's, and Lecturer of Wethersfield; Vicar of Fotheringhay, Northamptonshire.
Buswell, Rev. William, B.A., Vicar of Ruishton, Taunton.
Codd, Rev. Canon Alfred, M.A., Vicar of Beaminster; Rector of Stockton, Wilts.
Curtoys, Rev. W. F., M.A., Assistant Curate of West Hartlepool; Vicar of Coleby, near Lincoln.
Eager, Rev. A. R., Curate of Budock; Vicar of Manaccan, Cornwall.
Evans, Rev. John Arthur, Curate-in-Charge at Llandecwyn, Beaumaris.
Farrar, Rev. H. W., Chaplain to the Missions to Seamen at Bristol.
Finch, Rev. Thomas Ross, M.A., Licensed to Preach in the Diocese of Manchester.
Firth, Rev. E. B., Curate of St. Mary-le-Bow; Vicar-Choral in York Minster.
Forlong, Rev. Robert Rochfort, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Walpole St. Andrew, Norfolk.
Gill, Rev. Cecil Hope, M.A., Curate of Rondebosch; Rector of Mowbray, Capetown.
Gilman, Rev. John, M.A., Curate of Tudeley-with-Capel; Rector of Snargate-with-Snave, Kent.
Gross, Rev. A. W., Rector of Milton, near Northampton.
Hall, Rev. E. J., M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Epsom; Rector of Langtree, Devonshire.
Hull, Rev. Canon, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Northampton; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Northamptonshire (Mr. Cartwright of Aynhoe).
Jones, Rev. W. Morgan, M.A., Curate of Penmaenmawr; Minor Canon of Bangor Cathedral.
Lane, Rev. Henry Tydd, M.A., Diocesan Inspector of Schools; Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Baillie, Rev. John, D.D., Rector of Wyvenhoe, at Wyvenhoe Rectory, on the 17th inst., aged 74.
Cheales, Rev. Henry, of Hagworthingham, at Bournemouth, on the 18th inst., aged 93.
Freeman, Rev. Francis Elton, at Eastbourne, on the 4th inst., aged 55.
Moore, Rev. John Charles, M.A., late Vicar of Annamoe, county Wicklow, at Brampton Rise, Tunbridge Wells, on the 13th inst., aged 48.
Morgan, Charles, M.A., at Bryn-y-Garn, St. David's, Pembrokeshire, on the 19th inst, aged 74.
Nickoll, Rev. F. W., late Chaplain R.N., at Pierpoint, Lindfield, aged 63.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229224